




GIFT OF
Mrs. W. D. Baker



W. A. Baker

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

JESUS

BY GEORGE HOLLEY GILBERT

The Student's Life of Jesus, third edition, 1900.

The Revelation of Jesus, 1899.

The First Interpreters of Jesus, 1901.

A Primer of the Christian Religion, 1902.

Interpretation of the Bible, 1908.

The Book of Acts, 1908.

The Student's Life of Paul, 1899.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers 64-66 Fifth Avenue New York

J E S U S

BY

GEORGE HOLLEY GILBERT

Ph.D., Leipzig University

D.D., Dartmouth College



New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1912

All rights reserved

5-1
6/2/5

COPYRIGHT, 1912

By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Set up and electrotyped. Published September, 1912

THE
MACMILLAN
COMPANY

TO THE MEMORY
OF
Bertha Gates Gilbert
A NEAR DISCIPLE OF THE MASTER
WHO TO THE LAST HOUR OF HER YOUNG LIFE
SOUGHT TO DO
“SOMETHING GOOD AND BRAVE”

M106109

PREFACE

A different view of the sources of our knowledge of Jesus makes necessary a different story of his life. The decade and a half since my *Student's Life of Jesus* was published has witnessed a wide and important change among scholars in their estimate of the historical value of these various sources. In that change I have shared. Trained in the belief that the four Gospels are independent and supplementary accounts of the career of Jesus, each having its own point of view indeed but each also worthy of acceptance as essentially historical, I have come slowly, through prolonged study of the text, to results in respect to the sources which render it easier to re-write my book than to revise it. These results and the steps by which they were reached are stated in Part I.

But though this book registers essential modification of that view of the sources which was formerly held, and though, in consequence, it presents a somewhat different picture of the life of Jesus, it is nevertheless bound to the earlier editions by two bonds, viz., a purpose to get at the simple facts and an unchanged view of the vital work of the Master.

Influenced no doubt by the conclusions of fellow-workers—perhaps more deeply influenced than I am aware—it is yet true that the sources themselves, studied for the satisfaction of personal desire to know the truth, have led to every statement in the following story. No ecclesiastical authority or institutional connection has been present to influence, either for good or for ill, the weighing of evidence, or the portrayal of results.

As to the second bond of unity, it seems proper to say, in view of negative conclusions on such subjects as the supernatural birth of Jesus and his material resurrection, that critical study of the sources has not lessened but rather increasingly deepened my sense of the greatness

of Jesus and of the adequacy of his revelation to the needs of mankind. The conviction that he never called from the tomb a man who had been dead four days does not in the slightest degree weaken my faith in him as able to give spiritual life to men, for that faith rests on evidence immeasurably stronger than the story of Lazarus would be were it historically well established. Again, the belief that the "mighty works" of Jesus were, in his own thought of his mission, incidental and subordinate, and that they in no case transcended the power of a man who works with God—for such a man is open, we believe, to incalculable spiritual forces—does not at all impair my confidence in him as a revealer of God, or in his wisdom as the founder of the kingdom of heaven on earth. The story of his life to be drawn from the sources after the work of criticism has been done is a story abundantly suited to inspire confidence in him, as the spiritual leader of mankind, and the practice of his teaching invariably confirms that confidence.

This book therefore, though much unlike its predecessor, is yet, I would believe, one with that in spirit, and more truly constructive because resting on a more adequate analysis and estimate of the sources.

If it should appear to any readers that the space given to the consideration of *The Legendary Jesus* is too great, let these things be borne in mind: First, that some of the questions here discussed, like the story of the resurrection, are exceedingly complex and can least of all be dismissed in a summary manner; and, second, that the treatment of certain topics under the head of *The Legendary Jesus* does not imply an entire lack of value, even historical value, in these topics. But to ascertain the nature and extent of the truth involved, it is needful to recognize the limits of the legendary element.

It requires no special gift for divining the future course of events to see two things which will sooner or later come to pass in consequence of the critical investigation of the sources of the life of Jesus in our day, first, an unsettling of the faith of some people in him, and second, a reaction on the part of many Christians

from the new views and an attempt to support the tottering heritage of devout but unscientific ages. In helping to carry the Church forward through such times of stress and to establish it in a larger and truer conception of the Master there is perhaps no higher service which New Testament scholars can render than to set forth, with the utmost patience and accuracy, the simple facts of his life, assured that nothing can so further the Jesus-type of religious life as an intelligent acquaintance with Jesus himself.

I cannot conclude this prefatory word without an acknowledgment of the valuable suggestions given me by two of my friends and fellow-workers in the field of New Testament research, Professor Irving F. Wood, Ph.D., of Smith College, and Professor Ernest De Witt Burton, D.D., of the University of Chicago.

DORSET, VERMONT

February 12, 1912.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	vii
-------------------	-----

PART I. THE SOURCES

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS	3
II.	THE FOURTH GOSPEL	51
III.	OTHER SOURCES FOR THE LIFE OF JESUS .	73

PART II. THE HISTORICAL JESUS

I.	THE WORLD IN WHICH JESUS LIVED . . .	87
II.	ORIGIN AND EARLY LIFE	115
III.	ENTRANCE INTO PUBLIC LIFE	123
IV.	WHAT JESUS THOUGHT OF HIMSELF . . .	139
V.	THE IDEAL OF JESUS FOR HIS PEOPLE . .	154
VI.	THE RESOURCES AND THE METHOD OF JESUS	168
VII.	FROM THE JORDAN TO CAESAREA PHILIPPI .	183
VIII.	FROM CAESAREA PHILIPPI TO THE TRIUMPHAL ENTRY	200
IX.	FROM THE TRIUMPHAL ENTRY TO GOLGOTHA	215

PART III. THE LEGENDARY JESUS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. LEGENDS OF THE BIRTH AND INFANCY OF JESUS	239
II. LEGENDS OF THE MINISTRY OF JESUS . .	256
III. THE LEGEND OF A MATERIAL RESURRECTION	275

INDEXES

1. TO THE <i>Logia</i>	309
2. TO THE EARLIEST GOSPEL WITH SYNOPTIC PARALLELS	311
3. TO MATTHEW'S PECULIAR MATERIAL . . .	318
4. TO LUKE'S PECULIAR MATERIAL	318
5. TO THE FOURTH GOSPEL	319
CORRIGENDA	321

PART I
THE SOURCES

CHAPTER I

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

I. *Two ways of treating the Gospels as Sources of the Life of Jesus.*

THERE have long been and still are two radically different methods of treating the Gospels as sources of information on the life of Jesus. One method—very ancient and having the sanction of many great names—is to approach them as books of supernatural origin, and hence as altogether true and harmonious one with the others. But this view, though it is ancient, cannot claim to be the earliest. It cannot appeal to the men who produced the Gospels, or to the first generation of Christians who used them. Not only do the writers themselves make no claim to supernatural aid or intimate in any wise that their method of procedure was extraordinary, but the only one of them who alludes to the way in which he went about his work reveals clearly that the thought of supernatural aid did not enter his mind. Luke's introduction to his Gospel¹ claims only that he had made a careful and thorough investigation of all accessible sources of information. He had searched and discriminated and tested, and thus had written his story. Many before him had drawn up narratives on the same subject, but it is obvious that no one of these narratives wholly satisfied him, for in that case he would not have troubled himself to produce another. He looked at them all critically, and either in what they said or what they left unsaid they appeared to him seriously defective. This glimpse that Luke affords us into his mode of work might, so far as we know, have been given also by the writers of the first and the second Gospels. They, too, using their best judg-

¹ Luke 1:1-4.

ment, discriminated and selected from the material at hand. Analysis of their Gospels, especially of that of Matthew, clearly shows that they as well as Luke handled their materials with freedom.

Further, as the writers of the Gospels thought of their work, so for a considerable time do others appear to have regarded it. Clement of Rome (writing about 100 A. D.) has occasional quotations from the words of Jesus,¹ but gives no intimation whence he had derived them, whether from documents or oral tradition. The same is true of the *Epistle to Diognetus*,² Polycarp's (†166 A. D.) *Epistle to the Philippians*,³ Ignatius (†138 A. D.) in his *Epistle to the Ephesians*,⁴ to the *Romans*,⁵ to the *Smyr-nacans*,⁶ to *Polycarp*,⁷ and true also of the *Epistle of Barnabas*.⁸ These writers of the early second century make occasional references to Gospel words and incidents—much more frequent reference to the Old Testament—but they neither mention a *written* source, nor do their quotations and allusions necessarily imply such a source. If, then, they knew any of our Gospels—which can not be affirmed—it is clearly improbable that they ascribed to them any peculiar not to say supernatural authority. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia (writing about 130 A. D.), is the first to make definite reference to our evangelical literature. He says that "Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately whatsoever he remembered," i.e., what he remembered to have heard Peter say.⁹ There is obviously no more suggestion here of supernatural aid than in what Luke had said long before about his own writing.

To Papias is also ascribed a remarkable saying to this effect, that what he got from books—such books as the Gospels of Luke and Mark—was not so profitable as that

¹ See First Epistle, chpts. 13, 24, 27, 46.

² See chpts. 8, 9.

³ See chpts. 2, 6, 7.

⁴ See chpts. 5, 6, 14, 17, 19.

⁵ See ch. 6.

⁶ See chpts. 1, 2.

⁷ See ch. 2.

⁸ See ch. 5.

⁹ See Eusebius, *History*, 3, 39, 16.

which he drew from the stream of living *tradition*, that is, what he had heard one and another say who had listened to the first disciples.¹ This word clearly indicates that Papias, though he is said to have written a commentary on the sayings of the Lord,² gave to Mark's Gospel and to Matthew's "oracles," of which he speaks in the same fragment, no absolute authority. Both living tradition and written narrative he regarded as alike trustworthy.

In Justin Martyr (†165 A. D.) the Gospels come into clear view, for he says that they were read in the weekly gatherings of Christians, together with the Prophets.³ He calls them *memorabilia* (*ἀπομνημονεύματα*), a term which is suggestive rather of the exercise of human judgment in their composition than of supernatural aid.

But before the century of Papias and Justin closed a new view of the Gospels, as of all the New Testament, was well established. Irenaeus (115-202 A. D.) says that the apostles had perfect knowledge after the Holy Spirit had come upon them, and that they did equally and individually possess the Gospel of Christ.⁴ The four Gospels are now regarded as the four necessary aspects of the one Gospel and are said to have been given by the Artificer of all things.⁵ This high view, with various modifications by individual writers, is fully and frequently expressed in the first half of the third century, and it has been dominant in the Church from that time to the present.

The second way of treating the Gospels as sources for the life of Jesus is to regard them as natural products of the early Church. It is to approach them in precisely the same spirit in which Luke tells us that he produced his Gospel. While therefore it may be called the *modern* method in distinction from that of tradition, it is never-

¹ See Eus. Hist., 3, 39, 4.

² See Eus. Hist., 3, 39, 1.

³ See First Apology, 67.

⁴ See Ad. haer., 3, 1, 1.

⁵ See Ad. haer., 1, 11, 8.

theless simply the method which the preface to Luke's Gospel requires. We do not say that this method has no other justification than that which flows from the manner in which the evangelists used their materials and the way in which the subsequent generation regarded the Gospels, but only that this justification is quite adequate. If Luke's procedure was reasonable, then this modern method of treating the Gospels is also reasonable. They are to be approached and analyzed as natural products of the early Church. There is no absolute line of separation between them and other products of that Church which deal with the same subject, as the *Gospel of Peter* and the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. There is, demonstrably, no clear line of demarcation between Luke's Gospel and the narratives which he says had been drawn up before he wrote, for one of Luke's predecessors was Mark, and no one will assert that an *absolute* distinction is to be made between the writings of these men.

2. *The Sayings of Jesus (called also the Logia and Q¹).*

The first written contribution to our Gospel literature is now commonly held by scholars to have been a collection of the words of Jesus. Papias ascribed what may well have been such a composition, which he called the *Logia*, to the apostle Matthew,² and says that it was written in the Hebrew tongue, that is, the Aramaic dialect which was then spoken by the Jews of Palestine. He could not have had the first Gospel in mind, for the term which he used, *Logia*, oracles or sayings, does not properly describe that Gospel, large sections of which (e.g., chpts. 1-2, 27-28) are purely narrative; and further, it has long been agreed that our first Gospel was not written in Aramaic but in Greek. At the same time, however, no separate document containing the words of Jesus is known to have been extant in the Church at the beginning of the second century. Papias does not intimate that he had ever seen such a writing. But a collection of the words of the Master, made by one of his apostles, was surely a thing

¹ First letter of the German word *Quelle*=source.

² See Eusebius, *Church History*, 3, 39, 16.

which, though its form might be variously modified, could not easily be lost while the Church remained loyal to Jesus. Hence there is a strong presumption that this early collection of the Lord's sayings was indeed preserved in a writing or writings of later origin which were everywhere known and accepted.

Now this presumption is strikingly confirmed by the literary analysis of the first and third Gospels. A definite collection of the sayings of Jesus is here discovered. For the authors of these writings have in common a certain body of Jesus' words, and neither of them drew this common material from the other.¹ The necessary inference therefore is that both writers drew it from a common source,² in other words, that some previously existing collection of the sayings of Jesus was taken up and absorbed in our Gospels of Matthew and Luke. This collection was probably older than Mark's Gospel. The fact that it is the only collection of Jesus' sayings which was incorporated in any two of the Gospels implies that it was widely regarded as the standard collection, and this fact, while it *might* be explained by the eminence of its compiler, is more adequately explained if we suppose that it had also been a long time in circulation. Again, as compared with the earliest Gospel, this collection implies a higher antiquity by virtue of its greater simplicity with regard to the person of Jesus and with regard to the supernatural. It is relatively free from that interpretative element which is found in all the Gospels.

3. *The Extent and General Content of the Logia.*

The words of Jesus which Matthew and Luke have in common and which are not found elsewhere, if we include with them the preaching of the Baptist which also is peculiar to Matthew and Luke, amount approximately to one-sixth of the entire narrative.³ Assuming for the

¹ For detailed proof that Matthew and Luke wrote independently of each other the reader is referred to recent works on New Testament Introduction.

² It is of course possible that they used different editions of the *Logia*.

³ Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, sec. ed. 1909, p. 110, counts 186 verses and six fragments in Matthew, 179 verses and four fragments in Luke, as from the *Logia*; Huck's *Synopse* sets off 231 verses in Matthew and 210 in Luke as parallel; Holtzmann, *Das Leben Jesu*, 1901, credits Matthew with 441

present that this ancient document contained substantially only what is strictly common to Matthew and Luke, the following is a brief sketch of its content, not in the order of the original document itself, for that order cannot be determined, but in the order of Matthew.

There is, first, the Baptist's call to repentance with the solemn word that the Messiah who is near will deal as a judge with the wheat and the chaff;¹ then the story of the Temptation;² then a group of nineteen sayings put by Matthew in a single discourse but assigned by Luke to at least five different occasions;³ the centurion of Capernaum;⁴ words to would-be disciples;⁵ words to the disciples when they were sent out to preach and heal which Matthew associates with the mission of the Twelve alone,⁶ but which Luke associates in part with the mission of the Twelve,⁷ in part with that of Seventy,⁸ and in part with other occasions;⁹ the message to John the Baptist,¹⁰ and witness borne concerning him;¹¹ woes on certain Galilean cities;¹² thanksgiving to the Father for his revelation to "babes;"¹³ a word on the treasure of the heart;¹⁴ a defense against the charge of coöperating with Beelzebub;¹⁵ words on the craving for signs;¹⁶ on a second possession by unclean spirits;¹⁷ on the blessedness of disciples;¹⁸ the parable of the Leaven;¹⁹ words on the might

verses from the *Logia* and Luke with 217; Wernle, *Die Synoptische Frage*, 1899, gives Matthew 314 verses and Luke 230; Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus*, gives Matthew but 202 verses and Luke 195. The extent of the *Logia* varies according as one limits it to what is strictly common to Matthew and Luke, or allows it to have included somewhat more.

¹ Mt. 3:7-10=Lk. 3:7-9; Mt. 3:12=Lk. 3:17.

² Mt. 4:3-11=Lk. 4:3-13.

³ Mt. 5:1-4, 6=Lk. 6:20-21; Mt. 5:11-12=Lk. 6:20-23; Mt. 5:18=Lk. 16:17; Mt. 5:25-26=Lk. 12:58-59; Mt. 5:39, 40, 42=Lk. 6:29-30; Mt. 5:44-48=Lk. 6:27-28, 32-33, 36; Mt. 6:9-13=Lk. 11:2-4; Mt. 6:20-21=Lk. 12:33-34; Mt. 6:22-23=Lk. 11:34-35; Mt. 6:24=Lk. 6:13; Mt. 6:25-33=Lk. 12:22-31; Mt. 7:1-2=Lk. 6:37-38; Mt. 7:3-5=Lk. 6:41-42; Mt. 7:7-11=Lk. 11:9-13; Mt. 7:12=Lk. 6:31; Mt. 7:13-14=Lk. 13:23-24; Mt. 7:21=Lk. 6:46; Mt. 7:22-23=Lk. 13:26-27; Mt. 7:24-27=Lk. 6:47-49.

⁴ Mt. 8:5-10=Lk. 7:1-3, 6-9; Mt. 8:11-12=Lk. 13:28-29.

⁵ Mt. 8:19-22=Lk. 9:57-60.

⁶ Lk. 10:1-12.

⁷ Mt. 9:37-10:38.

⁸ Lk. 12:2-9, 11-12, 51-53; 14:25-27.

⁹ Lk. 9:1-5.

¹⁰ Mt. 11:2-6=Lk. 7:18-23.

¹¹ Mt. 11:7-19=Lk. 7:24-28, 31-35; 16:16 (?).

¹² Mt. 11:21-24=Lk. 10:13-15.

¹³ Mt. 11:25-27=Lk. 10:21-22.

¹⁴ Mt. 12:35=Lk. 6:45.

¹⁵ Mt. 12:22-23, 27-28, 30=Lk. 11:14, 19-20, 23.

¹⁶ Mt. 13:16-17=Lk. 10:23-24.

¹⁷ Mt. 12:38-42=Lk. 11:29-32.

¹⁸ Mt. 13:33=Lk. 13:20-21.

¹⁹ Mt. 12:43-45=Lk. 11:24-26.

of faith;¹ on causing offense;² on the twelve thrones for the twelve apostles;³ a condemnation of Pharisaism;⁴ words regarding the day of the Son of Man;⁵ a saying about watchful servants;⁶ and words about the faithful and unfaithful servant.⁷

Thus this document which Matthew and Luke used as one of their sources, though short, contained a wealth of fundamental teaching. Its omissions are indeed notable, for it had but one parable, possibly two,⁸ no miracles that seem to have been introduced for their own sake, though it had the healing of the centurion's servant,⁹ the healing of a dumb demoniac,¹⁰ and a reference to mighty works done in three Galilean cities;¹¹ it had nothing about the Lord's Supper, the crucifixion or the resurrection. But it contained Jesus' conception of the heavenly Father, his conception of man, his ideal of human life, and a clear implication of his Messiahship.

We remark in conclusion that, while an exact reproduction of the *Logia* can not be expected, there appears to be no good reason why we should not hold that its essential character and content are adequately made known to us through the common material of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke.

4. *Biographical Value of the Logia.*

The sketch of the general content of the *Logia* in the last section shows the wide difference between its suggestiveness for our view of the life of Jesus and that material bearing on this subject which we find in the letters of Paul. With the exception of the fact that Jesus had disciples, of whom twelve stood nearer to him than the rest, the *Logia* gives us no one of the details which

¹ Mt. 17:20=Lk. 17:6.

² Mt. 18:7=Lk. 17:1.

³ Mt. 19:28=Lk. 22:28-30.

⁴ Mt. 23:4, 12-13, 23, 25-26, 27, 29-31, 34-36, 37-39=Lk. 11:46; 14:11;

11:52, 42, 39, 41, 47-48, 49-51; 13:34-35.

⁵ Mt. 24:27-28, 37-41=Lk. 17:24, 26-27, 37.

⁶ Mt. 24:42-44=Lk. 12:37-40.

⁷ Mt. 24:45-51=Lk. 12:41-46.

⁸ See Mt. 18:12-14=Lk. 15:4-7.

⁹ Mt. 8:5-10, 11-12=Lk. 7:1-3, 6-9; 13:28-29.

¹⁰ Mt. 12:22=Lk. 11:14.

¹¹ Mt. 11:21-24=Lk. 10:13-15.

Paul has.¹ But this is not the most important aspect of the matter. The *Logia*, though collected and preserved as containing *thoughts* of Jesus, gives at the same time a series of living, intense glimpses of his *life*, which are the more valuable as undesigned and incidental. The information they convey often lacks definiteness in some direction: it is not complete or systematic, but it is vivid and suggestive. Thus the word that Jesus sent to the Baptist in prison pictures his own life-giving activity;² his words concerning John mirror the attitude of men toward himself and toward the Baptist;³ his words to would-be disciples on a certain occasion throw light on his poverty at that time and on the moral deadness of many who heard him;⁴ and the saying about the harvest and the laborers⁵ gives a vivid suggestion of a very different state of things. The woes on Galilean cities not only locate a part of his ministry, but also give an intense characterization both of its appeal and the dulness of the hearts on which the appeal fell.⁶ Again, through the words spoken in answer to the accusation brought against Jesus of being in league with Beelzebub⁷ we have light on the view which Jesus took of the casting out of demons, also on the permanency of the cures effected. The saying about Jonah and the Ninevites⁸ gives a broad characterization of Jesus' career as a *teaching* ministry, just as the word to the disciples about divisions⁹ throws light on the variety of results which his preaching had already produced.

Thus the *Logia* was a document of first-rate importance not only for the message of Jesus which it was intended to preserve, but also for the general character of his ministry and to some extent for its specific course.

5. *The First Narrative of the Career of Jesus.*

The *Logia*, or *Sayings*, of Jesus, though warm with biographical light, as we have just seen, gave the reader

¹ See Part I, ch. 3.

² Mt. 11:2-6=Lk. 7:18-23.

³ Mt. 11:7-9=Lk. 7:24-28, 31-35.

⁴ Mt. 12:22-23, 27-28, 30=Lk. 11:14,

⁵ Mt. 12:39-40=Lk. 11:29-30.

⁴ Mt. 8:19-22=Lk. 9:57-60.

⁵ Mt. 9:37-38=Lk. 10:2.

⁶ Mt. 11:21-24=Lk. 20:13-15.

⁷ Mt. 12:22-23, 27-28, 30=Lk. 11:14,

⁸ Mt. 12:39-40=Lk. 11:29-30.

⁹ Mt. 10:34-36=Lk. 12:51-53.

but little detail of the movement of Jesus' career and nothing about his death. It was natural then that the next step in the production of records to be used in extending the new religion should be a narrative giving prominence to what Jesus did and suffered. Such a narrative, according to the general consent of recent scholars, we have in the Gospel of Mark, and this, as far as we know, was the earliest of its kind. That it preceded the first and the third Gospels is shown by the generally accepted fact that these rest upon it as one of their sources—a point of which later sections will furnish illustrations.

This first account of the career of Jesus, to which with the others, since the time of Justin Martyr, the name *Gospel* has been given,¹ does not consist wholly of narrative, for about one-third of it is words of Jesus (about 231 verses out of a total of 661), but narrative is its characteristic feature. And this narrative enables the reader to follow the career of Jesus both in its outward and its inward movement, to picture to himself, at least with some degree of completeness, its geographical stages and also those critical events which determined its course. This is a fact of such great moment that it gives to the Gospel of Mark a unique value. We shall briefly consider each of these characteristics.

And first, this narrative contains an intelligent geographical outline of the public career of Jesus. It is not complete and is not always clear, but it is comparatively adequate. The "wilderness" (1:13) is vague, the first tour of Galilee leaves no definite local trace (1:39), the healing of the leper is not located (1:40), a second tour of villages is mentioned but in a wholly general manner (6:6), the place from which the Twelve are sent is left indeterminate (6:7), nor is any light thrown either on the direction or extent of their activity; we are not told where Jesus was while the Twelve were away on this mission; the narrative leaves us in doubt regarding the place where the disciples met Jesus after their tour was complete (6:30), and there is confusion in regard to their course with Jesus until they came to Gennesaret (6:53); there

¹ *First Apology*, 66.

is no trace of his movements in Perea after he had set out on the journey to Jerusalem (10:1), and in the narrative of the last week the statement that Jesus went forth out of the city every evening is by itself vague, leaving us in doubt *whither* he went (11:19). But notwithstanding all these deficiencies and obscurities in Mark's narrative, it enables us to follow the career of Jesus in its main features. From the Jordan and the wilderness he returned to Galilee and began his public ministry in and near Capernaum (1:14, 16, 21); from there he made a tour of Galilee (1:39), returning at length to Capernaum (2:1); on a mountain in the vicinity he appointed the Twelve (3:13, 20), and from Capernaum after a time went to the east side of the lake (5:1), returned again to Capernaum (5:21, 35), and from there went to his own country (6:1). After the mission of the Twelve and the withdrawal with them, on their return, to a desert-place which they reached by boat, we are on solid ground again at Gennesaret (6:53). From there Jesus went with his chosen band to the region of Tyre and Sidon (7:24), thence by way of the Decapolis he came to the eastern shore of the lake of Galilee (7:31), and from there by way of Bethsaida (8:22) to the villages of Caesarea Philippi (8:27). From this place again his course is clearly sketched—through Galilee (9:30) to Capernaum (9:33), then to Perea through the borders of Judea (10:1), and finally, by way of Jericho (10:46) to Jerusalem (11:1), where his movements through the last eventful week are in general carefully indicated.

We pass on to note the second fundamental characteristic of Mark's narrative—its preservation of the sequences of an orderly development. Thus the opposition to Jesus which arose in Capernaum on the occasion of the forgiveness of a man's sins (2:5-7), which was strengthened by Jesus' disregard of traditional statutes (2:16, 24; 3:2, 6), led at last to his withdrawal to heathen territory (7:24). Equally plain in Mark's narrative is the crucial significance of what transpired in the region of Caesarea Philippi (8:27-30). Prior to that time the attitude of Jesus toward Messiahship was one of extreme caution

and reserve. There was indeed the revelation at the Jordan, but that was to Jesus himself and not to others (1:11). The voice of the demoniac who acknowledged him as the "Holy One of God" was sternly silenced (1:24). Jesus left Capernaum, apparently because of the effect of his cures (1:35), and when, subsequently, he wrought any cure he sought to avoid excitement, which might easily lead to an attempt to force him into the popular Messianic rôle (1:44; 5:43; 7:36; 8:26). He presented himself to his disciples as a preacher (1:38), one who had authority to forgive sin (2:10) as well as power to cast out demons, but he made no Messianic claim.

At Caesarea Philippi, however, he accepted the confession of Messiahship in the circle of his disciples, though even then enjoining upon them that they should tell no man (8:30), and it was probably not earlier than this that he used the title "Son of Man." From this time to the day of Jesus' trial there is still in Mark's narrative the same reserve of Jesus *in public* regarding his Messiahship, though his intercourse with his disciples is in the light of the event at Caesarea Philippi (e.g. 8:31; 9:31-32; 10:33).

But although the Gospel of Mark thus enables the reader to follow the career of Jesus to some extent both in its outward and its inward development, it is probable that the author's real aim was religious rather than historical. The biographical motive was subordinate to the evangelistic. This is suggested already by the tradition that Mark's impulse to write came from Peter's *preaching*, and that this preaching was a source of his Gospel. For while Peter in his preaching may have told the story of Jesus' career, his purpose in so doing was not to teach history but to win converts. He selected and marshalled his facts with this end in view. Had Mark's aim been primarily historical, had he set out to write the life of Jesus, he would hardly have ignored its first thirty years, nor would he have allowed himself to dwell so long on the details of the work of Jesus as a healer and to pass so lightly over the details of his teaching ministry.

6. *The Sources of Mark's Gospel.*

According to Papias¹ the preaching of Peter seems to have been the exclusive, or at least the chief, source from which Mark drew. This view, however, does not appear to be supported by the analysis of the writing itself. For though it contains a large element that may well have been derived from those addresses of Peter which Mark had heard, it contains other material that does not point toward Peter as its source. To this analysis then it is needful that some thought be given.

Sir J. C. Hawkins, who has worked out the linguistic features of each of the Synoptic Gospels with minute care, finds that the fifty verses which are peculiar to Mark, though they constitute only about one-thirteenth of the entire Gospel, contain about one-tenth of the occurrences of characteristic words or phrases.² This fact may suggest that the author felt himself bound more closely by some of his material than by other parts, though, taken by itself, it cannot be given any great weight.

Other and more conclusive evidence that Mark rested in part on documents and not altogether on the preaching of Peter is furnished by the following facts. In the first place, in his reference to parables, he seems to indicate that more were known to him than he records, and known as having been spoken on a *particular occasion* (4:12, 10, 33, 35). This is most easily understood if he was acquainted with a *collection* of parables which indicated the occasions on which Jesus spoke them, or, if not a collection of parables, yet with some *document* that contained groups of parables. Again—and this point is still more important—in the account of the feeding of five thousand³ all the evangelists use the same Greek word for basket (*κόφινος*), and in the account of the feeding of four⁴ thousand the two evangelists who have this story (Matt. and Mark) use the same Greek word (*σφύρις*),

¹ Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, 3, 39, 15.

² That is, words or phrases that occur at least three times in the Gospel and which either occur at all in Matthew or Luke, or which occur in Mark often (three or more) in Matthew and Luke together.

³ See *op. cit.*, p. 11.

⁴ Mk. 6:30-44; Mt. 14:13-21; Lk. 9:10-17.

⁵ Mk. 8:1-10; Mt. 15:32-39.

but *not* that which is employed in the preceding narrative. Now the singular circumstance is that in the subsequent words of Jesus about dangerous "leaven"—words occasioned by the disciples' embarrassment because they had so little *bread* with them—the two Greek words are used, each one as in the original account. This schematic adherence to the particular terms of the respective narratives hardly admits of explanation except on the supposition that Mark had at this point written documents (at least two) before him, and documents which he regarded with great respect.

When now we ask what particular parts of Mark's narrative may have been drawn from Peter's preaching, we must admit that we can hardly advance beyond a moderate probability. To Peter may most naturally be traced the account of scenes that are located in his home in Capernaum,¹ and certain incidents personal to him.² It seems reasonable also to regard him as the source of such passages as clearly point to an eye-witness,³ for Mark, according to tradition, had not heard the Lord.⁴

The question of Mark's relation to the *Logia* is one on which it is difficult to reach a decided conclusion. The few instances in which he gives words of Jesus that are found in the Sermon on the Mount⁵ suggest that he may have drawn them from oral tradition, whence also he not improbably drew an appreciable element of his total material. If the evangelist had been acquainted with the *Logia* document, it would be strange indeed that he so completely ignored it.

7. *Matthew's Use of Mark's Gospel as a Source.*

On reading and comparing Mark's Gospel and Matthew's we notice, in the first place, that while Matthew has a large amount of matter not found in Mark, Mark

¹ 1:29, 2:1.

² 8:29, 10:28, 11:21, 16:7.

³ For example, 2:1-12.

⁴ The tradition is not invalidated even if the young man of 14:51-52 was Mark, for this momentary appearance does not imply discipleship or any special acquaintance with Jesus.

⁵ Mk. 4:24=Mt. 7:2; Mk. 9:50=Mt. 5:13, Lk. 14:34-35; Mk. 4:21=Mt. 5:14-16; Mk. 10:11=Mt. 5:32, 19:9; Lk. 16:18a.

has very little that is not found in Matthew. He has eight¹ short sections, aggregating thirty-six verses, or somewhat less than six per cent of the entire Gospel, and nine² very short passages, usually a single verse each, which either give an independent item not found in Matthew or certain notable details of some incident that is common to both narratives. With these slight exceptions the whole of Mark's Gospel is contained in Matthew. Further, Mark's order of narration is, in the main, followed in the first Gospel. Of some sixty-nine sections into which the common material of Matthew and Mark may be divided nearly ninety per cent follow in the same order in the narrative of Matthew as in that of Mark. There are in Matthew only four notable departures from Mark's order. Matthew puts a tour of Galilee (4:23-25) before the day of great works in Capernaum (8:14-17), which in Mark *follows* that day (1:29-39). The call of the Twelve is put by Matthew before the controversy regarding the Sabbath (10:2-4; 12:1-8, 9-14) instead of *after* it, as in Mark. The group of three events (or four)³—storm on the lake, cure of the Gerasene and cure of the daughter of Jairus, this latter incident enclosing the story of the woman who touched the garment of Jesus—are given *individually* in Mark's order, but the *entire group* is placed in a different setting. And finally, the mission of the Twelve (10:5-16) is put soon after their call (10:1), while Mark inserts between these events a certain teaching in parables, a visit to the region of Gerasa, the return to Capernaum and the rejection in Nazareth (3:13-6:7).

Matthew's agreement with the order of narration in Mark appears the more noteworthy when it is considered that he has inserted a large amount of independent material into the framework of Mark's Gospel. For had he not highly regarded the Marcan order of events in the life of Jesus, he might easily have allowed the introduction of new material to obscure it.

But these facts touching the relation of Matthew's

¹ 1:21-28, 35-38, 3:20-21, 4:26-29, 7:32-37, 8:22-26, 9:38-40, 12:41-44.

² 5:5; 6:5, 19, 55-56; 9:15-16, 21-24, 49-50; 11:11, 16; 12:32-34a; 15:44.

³ 8:18, 23-27, 28-34; 9:18-26.

Gospel to that of Mark, which have just been presented, are not in themselves proof that Mark's Gospel was a source of Matthew's work. They might be explained though the order of dependence were inverted. But when we take account not merely of the fact that Matthew's Gospel contains almost all the material of Mark and in Mark's order, but have regard also to certain *modifications* of the material in Matthew, then the question of the priority of Mark's Gospel is seen to be closed, and doubt on the order of the two writings is excluded.

First of all, the Greek of Matthew is better than that of Mark. Thus for a number of rare and questionable terms used by Mark, we have in Matthew terms that are unobjectionable.¹ Instead of the constant and monotonous repetition of the conjunction *and*, the parallel narrative of Matthew offers a good degree of variety.² And again, where Mark's narrative has redundant expressions, as is frequently the case, Matthew removes the redundancy.³

This better Greek of Matthew's narrative is explicable as a refinement on that of Mark, but we could not assume that Mark, having this better Greek before him, would have cast it aside for something inferior. For though his Greek style is often criticizable—a fact not at all to be wondered at in view of his Jewish nationality and his traditional residence in Jerusalem—it would not be allowable to suppose that he was an uneducated man, or one

¹For κρέβατος (e.g., 2:4), condemned by Phrynicius (see Rutherford, *New Phrynicius*, pp. 137-8), Matthew has κλίνη (9:2); for ἐπιράπτει (2:21), not elsewhere in the N. T., Matthew has ἐπιβάλλει (9:16); for θυγάτριον, only in Mk. 5:23, 7:25 in the N. T., Matthew has θυγάτηρ (9:18); for ἐσχάτως ἔχει (condemned by Phrynicius, see Rutherford, p. 481), not used elsewhere in the N. T., Matthew has ἐτελεύτησεν (9:18), obviously not an equivalent; for σύσσημον (14:44), unknown elsewhere in Greek, Matthew has σημεῖον (26:48), and for προαύλιον (14:68), found only in Mark, Matthew has πυλῶν (26:71). The term ἐκεφαλῶσαν (12:4), unknown elsewhere in Greek, is avoided by Matthew.

²Thus Matthew in 4:1 replaces the καί of Mark with τότε, in 4:18 with δε, in 9:10 with a participial construction. Where Mark uses καί eighty-six times in beginning sections of his narrative, Matthew has it only thirty-five times.

³The following passages will sufficiently illustrate this feature. Mk. 1:32 has "And at even, when the sun did set;" Mt. 8:16 omits the second clause. Mk. 2:20 reads: "And then will they fast, in that day," but Mt. 9:15 drops the tautological words "in that day." Mk. 2:25 has "Did ye never read what David did, when he had need and was hungry," but in Mt. 12:3 the last clause is dropped.

who would not have sought the most suitable language in which to set forth his story.

But, in the second place, not only is the Greek of Matthew better than that of Mark, but his modification of the *thought* of Mark's Gospel also leads irresistibly to the conclusion that he wrote at a later time. Consider first a series of passages which concern Jesus. Mark says that in the evening of the notable day when the ministry in Capernaum was begun Jesus healed *many* who were sick with divers diseases (1:34), a statement that allows the reader to think that there were some sick people present whom he did *not* heal; but Matthew tells us that on this same occasion Jesus healed *all* who were sick (8:16). Again, when Jesus visited Nazareth during his ministry, Mark records that he *could* do no mighty work there, save that he laid his hands on a few sick folk and healed them (6:5). It is clear that he thought of the power of Jesus in this case as limited. Only a few sick folk and they not extreme cases (*ἀπώστοις*) were cured. The unbelief of the people of Nazareth prevented further manifestations of the gracious might of Jesus. But Matthew makes a significant change. He does not say that Jesus *could* do no mighty work, but simply, "he did not" (13:58). The suggestion of *inability* to heal is thus removed. Another illustration is furnished by the story of the withered fig-tree. According to Mark (11:12, 20) the disciples did not notice that the fig-tree was withered until at least the day after Jesus had sought fruit on it; but Matthew represents that the withering took place immediately, to the great amazement of the disciples (21:19-20). Obviously this report sets the act of Jesus in a stronger light—renders the miracle more impressive. A fourth parallel instance is found on comparing Mark 6:3 with Matthew 13:55. According to Mark, the Nazarenes said of Jesus: "Is not this the carpenter?" but in Matthew their query runs: "Is not this the *son* of the carpenter?" Thus the expression is softened and made less objectionable for those who separated Jesus from other men as widely as possible.

There is another class of passages in Matthew's Gospel

which modify Mark by suggestive omissions. Thus he omits the cure of the man in Decapolis who was deaf and had an impediment in his speech (7:32-35) and the cure of the blind man in Bethsaida (8:22-26), the two instances of healing which have the least glamour of the supernatural about them. In both cases Jesus made use of spittle and in one case the cure was gradual. Again, Mark says that Jesus on a certain occasion in the synagogue at Capernaum looked round on the people *with anger* (3:5), and that at another time he was moved with *indignation* (10:14); Matthew omits both expressions. Mark also tells us that the relatives of Jesus thought he was *beside himself* (3:21); this too Matthew omits. In the story of Jesus on the lake Mark says (6:48) that "he would have passed by them;" Matthew omits this. He also makes a significant omission in the account of the sending for an ass on which Jesus might ride into the city, for he does not say, with Mark (11:3), that the Lord would send the ass back to the owner—an omission which heightens the authority with which Jesus proceeds in the matter. Finally, in the incident of the withered tree, Mark's word of apology for the tree's barrenness, namely, that it was not "the season of figs," is not found in Matthew. Its omission in this writing may have been dictated by the desire to defend the act of Jesus from the charge of unreasonableness.

Now these eight omissions are in line with the *positive* modifications of Mark's thought which Matthew makes and are therefore naturally to be ascribed to the same motive. Both classes of passages are intelligible if Matthew used Mark as a source, but not if that relation be inverted. In keeping with the fact that Jesus was more and more exalted as time passed and as the evidences of his gracious power accumulated, we must regard Matthew's narrative as secondary and Mark's as primary, since Matthew *removes* these questionable features of Mark's picture of Jesus.

We conclude then that our first Gospel used Mark as one of its sources. Further, it would not be too much to say that the writer regarded this earlier document as his

standard authority. He incorporates nearly all of it in his own story and he rarely departs from its order of narration. The sole important feature of it which seemed to him inadequate was its view of Jesus, except, of course, the fact that it seemed to him to *leave out* much valuable material.

8. *Matthew's Use of the Logia as a Source.*

Outwardly, the most notable point in Matthew's use of the *Logia* is his grouping of the material. Thus he brings together in one address delivered on a "mountain" (5:1) words which in Luke are represented as spoken on a half dozen separate occasions. The address itself bears marks of its composite character, for it contains some material that does not suit the time and the occasion on which it is said to have been spoken. Thus, for example, the severe condemnation of scribes and Pharisees (5:20; 6:2, 5, 16) does not belong at the beginning of the Galilean ministry, nor can we suppose that the words 7:21, 22 were spoken long before Jesus had let even his chosen disciples know that he regarded himself as the Messiah—a revelation that dates from the days at Caesarea Philippi (16:13). Again, this grouping of material from the *Logia* is obvious in the address to the apostles, which was given on the occasion of their going out in Galilee during the life-time of Jesus (10), for this address contains passages which clearly belong to a much later time (e.g., 16:16-18, 23, 34). They are brought together here simply because they come under the general head of instructions to the disciples in view of their work in the world.

The strong impression of topical grouping which is made by these addresses in Matthew is abundantly confirmed by a comparison of Matthew with the Lucan parallels. This point, however, needs no elaborate illustration. Take simply the case of the Lord's Prayer. According to Matthew, that Prayer was given to the disciples by Jesus on his own initiative, as a part of the body of fundamental teaching which he communicated to them on the mountain, but according to Luke (11:1-4), it was given in response to a request of the disciples, and given long

after the Sermon on the Mount. This Lucan representation is intrinsically probable as far as the initiative is concerned. For Jesus never established new rites and ceremonies for his followers, unless indeed we suppose an exception in this single case. It was wholly foreign to his method and purpose. He who left his disciples members of the Jewish Church, who did not suggest that they should establish an organization by themselves, would not have been likely to prescribe, of his own accord, a form of prayer. He was concerned to create a new life in the heart, not to reform the Jewish ritual. Hence the account of Luke in reference to the occasion of the Lord's Prayer is to be preferred to that in Matthew. It was not a part of the fundamental teaching of the Sermon on the Mount, but was put there by the author of the first Gospel in pursuance of his plan to give a topical arrangement of his material.

This view that the first evangelist made an independent grouping of the material which he had before him in the *Logia* is further confirmed by the fact that he appears to represent Jesus as having given to his disciples *five* series of words or teachings,¹ which, in the light of the Gospel narrative, is plainly an arbitrary division. The occasions on which Jesus spoke in Galilee, in Perea and in Jerusalem were numerous, one might safely say nearer five hundred than five. But one whose scheme of presenting the teaching of Jesus led him to make this general five-fold division² would obviously have proceeded with perfect freedom in the grouping of individual sayings of Jesus.

A second point to be noticed in Matthew's use of the *Logia* is a certain freedom in dealing with the thought. This is plainly in line with the preceding characteristic, for the grouping of the Lord's words, in so far as it obscures the *occasion* on which different words were spoken, may not only render their interpretation difficult, but may also easily *modify* their original sense.

¹ See the formula "when Jesus had finished these words," with slight modifications, in 7:28; 11:1; 13:53; 19:1; 26:1.

² Had this division belonged to the *Logia* itself, which Hawkins suggests as possible, it would seem a little strange that no clear trace of it is to be found in Luke. The single use of an expression (7:1) parallel to Matthew's formula is hardly such a trace.

This freedom of the first evangelist in handling the thought of the *Logia* is a matter of great importance, and though it is not necessary at present to study every point which illustrates this freedom, the truth of the assertion ought to be put beyond question. For that purpose we shall consider a number of passages which set the compiler's freedom in a clear and strong light.

According to Luke, Jesus pronounced a blessing on the "poor" (6:20); according to Matthew, on the poor "in spirit" (5:3); according to Luke, he blessed the "hungry" (6:21); according to Matthew, those who are hungry "after righteousness" (5:6). The Lucan saying starts from the physical¹ state, if it is not concerned with that altogether; the Matthaean begins and ends with the spiritual. The version in Luke is more difficult than that in Matthew. It is easy to believe that the word "poor" may have been interpreted to mean poor *in spirit*, but not that a writer who had the words "poor in spirit" changed them to *poor*. If Jesus spoke a blessing on the poor, leaving that word undefined, we can see that it may have been regarded as putting a premium on poverty, and that Christian teachers, rightly feeling that this was not consistent with the life and general teaching of Jesus, defined the term as is done in Matthew.

As a second instance of the freedom under discussion, take the Lord's Prayer. Matthew's version is half as long again as Luke's, Luke having thirty-eight words (Greek) and Matthew fifty-seven. Matthew has seven petitions and Luke only five. But the two which are peculiar to Matthew are only an unessential expansion of the thought contained in Luke. But since the style of Jesus is known to us as concise and full of vigor, it is more probable that the amplifying words of Matthew are a late modification than that they are original.

A third illuminating instance is the sign of Jonah. According to Luke, this consisted in Jonah's appearing as a prophet in Nineveh (11:30), and the sign of the Son of Man to his generation was to be of the same sort. No "sign" such as men were demanding—no miracle—should

¹ This is made all the plainer by the contrast in verse 24.

be given, but only the sign of Jonah, that is, the simple prosaic fact of preaching. But Matthew's understanding of the sign is wholly different from this. To him the sign consisted in Jonah's experience with the sea-monster, and the parallel in the case of the Son of Man was to be his burial in the earth for three days and three nights (12:40). This view, however, is entirely unsuited to the occasion on which Jesus spoke of the sign of Jonah. He had positively refused to give a sign such as was demanded by scribes and Pharisees (12:39), but this interpretation represents him as immediately setting aside his own explicit refusal and as granting a supernatural sign after all. Further, it is to be noted that the resurrection of Jesus was *not* a sign to that unbelieving generation. The risen Lord, according to the Gospels, appeared only to his *own disciples*. We must then regard Matthew's version of this saying of Jesus as a departure from the *Logia*, if we ascribe Lk. 11:30 to that document. That version exhibits a marked characteristic of the author of the first Gospel, for he delighted in the discovery of hidden agreement between details in the life of Jesus and passages of the Old Testament.

Another instance of the relatively great freedom with which Matthew handled the thought of the *Logia* is furnished by the passage in regard to the pardon of an offending brother. Jesus affirmed, according to Luke (17:3-4), that one should forgive a penitent brother without limit, even seven times in a single day. But in Matthew we have the outline of a course of procedure that appears to be a clear reflection of early ecclesiastical practice (18:15-17). For Jesus is represented as referring the matter to the *Church*, though he nowhere in the synoptic Gospels contemplates the departure of his followers from the Jewish religious fellowship or intimates that they are to establish a new organization. And further, he is not only represented as directing his disciples to refer the matter to the Church, but also as making the Church's decision final. Continued impenitence on a brother's part justifies the treatment of him as a heathen and a publican. This outcome surely does not

breathe the spirit of Jesus, but rather that of the early Church in its struggle with unworthy members.¹

A final illustration of Matthew's freedom is afforded by the story of the Wedding Feast or Great Supper.² The freedom of the first evangelist is seen especially in two additions. When the invitation to the feast is persistently declined, the host is angry. Luke says no more than this. But in Matthew the King who offers the feast sends out his armies and burns the city in which the people live whom he has invited. But this again does not show the spirit of Jesus who instead of destroying those who did not accept his invitation allowed them to destroy him. Thus we find here a disturbing element, which appears to have been brought into the story from subsequent history, for Jerusalem, whose citizens did not welcome Jesus, was actually burned by the Romans. The second addition to the story is in the spirit of the first (22:11-13). A king who would burn a city whose inhabitants had refused his invitation to a feast might be expected to act as the king does in verses 11-13. He gives command that the man who has no wedding-garment be bound hand and foot and be cast into the outer darkness. We need not stop to discuss this passage further than to say that it seems to be an addition inasmuch as its thought is foreign to the manifest purpose of the parable. That purpose is to teach that the "feast" which the Jews refuse will be offered to others less favored than they. But the thought of verses 11-13 is obviously quite different. It is not concerned with the acceptance of the kingdom of heaven, but with some subjective preparation for membership therein. We need not inquire what deep theological meaning the author saw in the "wedding-garment." It is enough for the present to recognize that his addition to Luke's version takes us into a different sphere of thought and one not in harmony with the lesson of the parable.

The data which we have now considered seem fully to establish the view that the author of the first Gospel exercised a large degree of freedom both in the arrange-

¹ See e.g., I Cor. 5:5; I Tim. 1:20; III Jn. 9-10.

² Mt. 22:1-14; Lk. 14:15-24.

ment and in the treatment of the material found in the *Logia*. That document was for him a standard authority, as was the Gospel according to Mark, but nevertheless he did not incorporate it in his narrative unchanged, even as he did not that earlier Gospel. His interest in prophecy, which we find illustrated in other portions of his story besides that which he had from the *Logia*, moulded his use of that material, as did also the course of early Christian history.

9. *Matthew's Peculiar Material.*

About one quarter of the first Gospel—approximately 260 verses—is not found elsewhere, and so may be regarded as the peculiar property of the author. Of this large mass of material only about four per cent consists of incidents in the ministry of Jesus.¹ Nearly one quarter of it concerns his childhood or consists of details of his death and resurrection, the remaining seventy-two per cent of Matthew's peculiar matter is teaching of Jesus.

Of the incidents in the ministry of Jesus, which only Matthew has, all but one are supernatural, and the two main incidents are distinctly marked off from the ordinary mighty works of Jesus. These are Peter's walking on the water (14:28-31) and his finding a coin in the mouth of a fish (17:24-27). Remarkable in character are also Matthew's details in the story of the death and resurrection of Jesus. Thus an earthquake followed the death on the cross, and opened certain tombs in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, and from these the bodies of saints were raised, and entering into the holy city they appeared unto many (27:51-53). Again, the great earthquake which in Matthew preceded the resurrection seems to have been regarded as supernatural in its origin, for it resulted from the descent of an angel out of heaven (28:2).

These incidents give to the first Gospel a unique coloring. The typical mighty work of Jesus, according to all the synoptists, is the cure of disease, but these events recorded by Matthew alone—namely, the two in which Jesus is active—lie in the realm of nature. It may fitly

¹ Viz., 14:28-31; 17:24-27; 21:10-11, 14.

be noticed in this connection that Matthew's version of miraculous incidents which are common to all the synoptists reveals a tendency to *emphasize* the *supernatural*. Thus, while Mark represents Jesus as helping the mother of Peter's wife to rise from her bed (1:31), Matthew says that Jesus touched her hand and *she arose* (8:15). Again, Mark says that the little daughter of Jairus was *at the point of death* (5:21), Matthew says that she was already dead (9:18). Mark tells us that Jesus, just prior to the feeding of the multitude near Bethsaida, taught them many things (6:34); Matthew says nothing of his teaching, but writes that Jesus healed the sick (14:14).

In view of the supernatural element in Matthew's peculiar material we are doubtless justified in attributing to him also these touches whereby the miraculous in the triple¹ tradition is made more impressive. The writer is thus brought before us as one who laid stress on the miraculous and who made no distinction between the typical healing of the sick and such prodigies as finding a coin in the mouth of a fish and walking on water.

But it is in the sphere of doctrine that the peculiar matter of the first Gospel departs most widely from the common teaching of all the synoptists. This departure is obvious, first, in its doctrine of Christ, and second, in its ecclesiology. We begin with Matthew's addition to the older account of the baptism of Jesus (3:14-15). The hesitation of John the Baptist when Jesus stood before him is psychologically conceivable, though opinions may differ as to whether it is *probable*, but the response of Jesus to John's word is not so easily accepted. For it represents his submission to the rite of baptism as having only a temporary (*ἄρτι*) and superficial (*πρόπον*) significance, whereas we are constrained by the profound experience of God's favor, which Jesus had immediately after his baptism, to believe that he came to the Jordan with a great longing to dedicate himself to the kingdom of God but *with no thought that he himself was called to realize that kingdom*. Further, the difficulty of accepting Mt.

¹ This term is more convenient than accurate. It is the *attestation* of tradition that is triple rather than the tradition itself.

3:15 as words of Jesus is heightened by the circumstance in vs. 17 that what in Mark is a message to the soul of Jesus is here a testimony to the Baptist. The writer apparently did not think that Jesus *needed* a divine affirmation of his sonship to God. But when we find that the writer of Mt. 3:17 departs from the older conception of the heavenly message which we have in Mk. 1:11, and that his new conception has the same obvious aim as the incident in vs. 14-15, which he alone gives, we cannot avoid the conclusion that the later view of the person of Jesus, which is fully developed in John, has found its way into Matthew's story of the baptism.¹

We pass to the interpretation of the parable of the Tares (13:37-43). There are reasons which appear weighty why we should regard this as an early Christian interpretation. Thus, in the first place, it attaches a symbolic meaning to the *details* of the parable—a fact which, since it makes the teaching of the passage vague, we can hardly ascribe to Jesus himself. Again, this interpretation declares that the field is the *world*, but Jesus limited his activity to the house of Israel. Even later than the time when this passage was spoken he was only constrained to help the Syro-Phoenician woman by her extraordinary faith (Mk. 7:26-29). Jesus doubtless anticipated that his ministry would bless other peoples than the Jews, and toward the close of his life this thought found plainer expression; but it is quite clear that he regarded Israel as the field of his own labors. So obvious was this devotion of Jesus that his apostles continued in the same field, and it was only after a special discipline that Peter ventured to preach the Gospel to the Gentile Cornelius (Acts 10). It was in large degree the work of Paul that brought home to the consciousness of the Church that the field is the *world*. Once more, it is unfavorable to the originality of this Matthaean interpretation that it speaks of the angels and the kingdom as *belonging* to the Son of Man (vs. 41). The angels are never thus described in

¹ Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, pp. 4, 7, calls attention to the fact that this addition contains three characteristic Matthaean words—*ἄρι*, *δικαιοσύνη*, and *πληρώ*.

Mark or Luke, nor, with the partial exception of Lk. 22:29, does either of these Gospels ever speak of a kingdom of the Son of Man. In them the angels are always angels of *God*, when *any* ownership is expressed,¹ and the kingdom in the full sense of the term is always the possession of God. The usage then of the first Gospel² in this point is in harmony with its story of the baptism of Jesus, but is not supported by Mark and Luke. Finally, it is not favorable to the originality of Matthew's interpretation of the Tares that it uses symbols of judgment which Mark and Luke never use. Such are the "furnace of fire" and "the weeping and the gnashing of teeth." This latter expression is found six times³ in Matthew, never in Mark and but once in Luke (13:28), where, however, it has a meaning quite different from that which it uniformly has in Matthew. But this symbolism of suffering and judgment which is not found in the oldest Gospel nor in Luke's version of the *Logia* is akin to that of the apocalyptic writings and the Psalms rather than to the language of Jesus.⁴ Thus there seems to be good reason for the conclusion that the interpretation of the parable of the Tares is not from Jesus.

The next significant passage in the peculiar material of Matthew is 16:18-19: "And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Now as we have seen, Matthew's narrative rests on Mark as one of its chief sources, and tradition makes Peter a chief source of Mark. But if Peter was a chief source of Mark, it would be most strange if he had not communicated to him this surpassingly important word of Jesus. Yet had Mark *known* this word, we cannot easily believe that he would have omitted it from his narrative of the great event at Caes-

¹ Lk. 1:11; 2:9; 12:8; 15:10.

² 16:27, 28; 20:21; 24:31.

³ 8:12; 13:42-50; 22:13; 24:51; 25:30.

⁴ See Dan. 3:6; *Similitudes of Enoch* 54:6; Psalms 112:10.

area Philippi, especially as it put high honor on a man to whom he was deeply indebted.

Again, in this word to Peter there is a play on the name of the apostle: "Thou art *Petros* and upon this *petra* I will build my Church." But the language of Jesus was Aramaic, and the Aramaic does not allow this play on the name. It is peculiar to the Greek. Then there is the strange fact that Jesus is here represented as using the word "Church." No reason is apparent why he should not have used the word "kingdom," which he had employed from the beginning of his ministry and which he continued to employ after this day at Caesarea Philippi. Why a new term just here, and one never used in either of the other Gospels? Let it be noted also that though Matthew uses the word "Church" on one other occasion (18:17), he uses it there in a different sense, and that the two senses—that of a local body and that of the Church universal—are what we find in Paul. Moreover it does not accord with the well established usage of Jesus that he should have said "*I* will build" and "*My*" Church. He taught his disciples to pray to the Father. "*Thy* kingdom come;" and although he regarded himself as the Messiah, the Gospel contains no explicit and undoubted words of his in regard to a personal activity on earth after his death. But at the time of the event at Caesarea Philippi Jesus clearly regarded his death as imminent (16:21), and therefore the building of the Church here contemplated implies a *posthumous* activity on his part. Then too the relative position assured to Peter in vs. 19 plainly conflicts with the unquestioned words and practice of Jesus and also with apostolic history. It is impossible to see how one who declared that rank among his disciples must depend on service rendered,¹ and who, at a later day, said it was not in his power to grant the request of James and John that they might have the first places in his kingdom,² one who, after the day at Caesarea Philippi, never intimated to Peter that

¹ See Mk. 9:35; Mt. 20:27; Lk. 22:26.

² See Mk. 10:40; Mt. 20:23.

he was to have a higher authority than the other apostles, can have spoken the words of Mt. 16:18-19.

And these words in Matthew are not only in conflict with the teaching and practice of Jesus but in conflict also with apostolic history. For though Peter was conspicuous in the Church at Jerusalem,¹ neither the letters of Paul nor the book of Acts distinguishes him *officially* from the other apostles.

We conclude then that this particular item in Matthew's peculiar matter acquaints us not with words and thoughts of Jesus, but rather with the early Catholic movement.

Another important passage that is peculiar to Matthew is the dramatic account of the Judgment (25:31-46). There are three serious objections to the genuineness of this passage as it stands. First, it conflicts with what the Gospels elsewhere represent as the habitual attitude of Jesus toward the subject of future awards. That attitude is one of great reserve. The *Logia* has significant allusions to judgment, but they are brief and incidental.² The earliest Gospel has fewer allusions to the subject than has the *Logia*, and these are of the same general character.³ But here in Matthew we have a formal and complete judgment scene. Second, the terminology of this passage in Matthew departs widely from the usage of Jesus as elsewhere shown in the Gospels. Thus a "throne of glory" is found in the Gospels only here and in Mt. 19:28—a passage not supported by the other narratives; and nowhere else is Jesus represented as calling himself "king." The cognate phrase of 13:41 and 16:28 is not supported by the *Logia*, by Mark or Luke. Then certain terms are used here of the wicked which are limited either to this passage or to this gospel. Here only is the word "cursed" (*κατηραμένοι*) ascribed to Jesus when he speaks of the wicked, and here only occurs the expression "eternal punishment" (vs. 46). Nowhere else except in 18:8 (Mk. 9:43) do the Gospels use the term "eternal fire," and there the earlier Gospel has "unquenchable."

¹ See Gal. 1:18; 2:9; I Cor. 1:12; 3:22; Acts 1:15; 2:14, etc.

² See, e.g., Lk. 13:26, 28; 12:5, 9, 46; Mt. 10:32-33.

³ Mk. 8:38; 10:30; 13:26-27.

Finally, under this head, this passage is the only one in the Gospels where bad men are assigned to the same fate with the Devil and his angels. Third, it is unfavorable to the genuineness of this passage that its basis of judgment is not in accord with other teaching of Jesus. The righteous are accepted because they have ministered to the bodily needs of the King's "brethren," and those on the left hand are rejected because they have *not* ministered to the bodily needs of the King's brethren. The righteous do not recognize that in serving the hungry and the thirsty, they are serving the King. Their *motive* seems not to be taken into account at all. The King regards what they have done for his brethren as done for him, and thereon pronounces them blessed. Now this teaching departs in two points from the common thought of Jesus. In the first place, the personal relation to Jesus is not mentioned nor necessarily implied, yet this relation is represented as fundamental in various unquestioned passages.¹ And second, in this judgment scene of Matthew, the ministry which wins the Father's Kingdom is ministry to the King's "brethren," but both the example and precept of Jesus enjoin the duty of service toward all who *need* service, and not simply toward the righteous.²

We pass now to Mt. 18:20, with which the related passage 28:20b is to be coupled. The assertion of Jesus in 18:20 that he would be with two or three disciples gathered in his name and the kindred assertion of the risen Lord to the eleven apostles that he would be with them always, even unto the consummation of the age, are not only peculiar to Matthew, but like the entire series of passages which have just been considered they are alien to the common tradition of the Lord's teaching. The *Logia* has no intimation of this thought. On the contrary, in the word of encouragement to his disciples in view of future need, which Matthew took from the *Logia* (10:20), Jesus says: "It is not ye who speak but the *Spirit of your Father* speaketh in you." He turns their

¹ See Mk. 8:38; Mt. 10:32-33; 16:24-26; 7:24; 8:5-13; 10:39; Mk. 9:37, with their Lucan parallels.

² See, e.g., Mk. 10:45; Lk. 10:25-37; 15.

thought not to his own presence with them but to the presence of the Father. As in the *Logia*, so in the later Gospel narrative, the thought of a future presence of Jesus with his disciples is excluded. The triple tradition speaks of his "rising,"¹ but not of his continuing on earth. Such continuance would conflict with the frequently expressed idea of a *coming* of the Son of Man.² When Jesus took leave of his disciples on the evening before his crucifixion, he alluded to a reunion in the Kingdom of God—a fact which is obviously at variance with the idea of Mt. 18:20.

Finally, peculiar to Matthew and at the same time foreign to the common synoptic teaching is the passage 28:18-20a. The assurance of the oldest Gospel (16:7) was that in Galilee the disciples should "see" the risen one; there was no promise or suggestion of new *teaching*. Paul speaks of appearances of the risen Lord, but does not intimate that he gave further teaching to his disciples. Thus the very circumstance that, according to Mt. 28:18-20a, a weighty teaching was communicated to the disciples by the risen Master is suspicious. It is not supported by Mark or Paul, who give us our earliest material bearing on the resurrection. But this teaching itself is the insuperable obstacle in the way of accepting the genuineness of the passage. When examined in the light of the ministry of Jesus in word and deed, this alleged post-resurrection utterance is found wanting.

It is unlike the synoptic Jesus, in the first place, to declare that all authority in heaven and on earth has been given to him. The only seeming parallel is in Mt. 11:27, but when examined closely that is found to be far from parallel to the passage before us. For the "all things" of which that passage speaks are obviously the *knowledge* of the Father which Jesus possessed—a statement quite different from a claim to all authority in heaven and on earth. But were one to assume that this high authority had been conferred on Jesus *after* his resurrection, then one would make an assumption which nothing in the

¹ See Mk. 8:31; 9:31; 10:34 with parallels.

² E.g., Mk. 8:38; 13:26; 14:62.

words of Jesus remotely suggests. But this claim to all authority does not stand here by itself: it is part of the writer's conception of Christ and is supplemented by the following verse. For doubtless by placing the Son between the Father and the Holy Spirit the writer wished to be understood as claiming for him essential divinity. This claim brings the passage into line with the Christology of Paul's later epistles and of the fourth Gospel. How far removed it is from the teaching of Jesus himself may be indicated with sufficient clearness and completeness by a survey of what he claims for himself according to the *Logia*. We have the most comprehensive statement of his claims in Mt. 11:27. According to this statement, Jesus and he alone has a complete knowledge of the Father, and he can impart this to other receptive souls. One conscious of possessing this knowledge and power could say, as Jesus did, that the man who heard and did his words was like one who builds on the rock (Mt. 7:24); he could reasonably look for faith in his word and rejoice when he found it (Mt. 8:10); he could say that confession or denial of him was of transcendent importance (Mk. 8:38; Mt. 10:32); he could say that the members of his kingdom were greater than John the Baptist, though John was equal to any of the former prophets (Mt. 11:11); he could declare that he had come to fulfil the Old Testament (Mt. 5:17), and also that something greater than Jonah and greater than Solomon had been manifested in his appearance and work (Mt. 12:41-42); and because all this was true, he could pronounce his disciples more blessed than the kings and prophets of old (Mt. 13:16-17). Yea more, one conscious of possessing this knowledge of the Father and of an appointment to transmit it to others might naturally believe that the "day of Jehovah" known to the Old Testament would at last appear as the "day of the Son of Man" (Lk. 17:23, 24, 27).

Thus, according to the *Logia*, Jesus, though in the line of the prophets, was far above them. He had a unique mission as revealer of God and builder of his kingdom. But the *Logia* document does not enter at all into the

sphere of thought of Mt. 28:19. It involves the consciousness of a unique knowledge of God, but contains no suggestion regarding transcendental relationships.

Again, it does not accord with the synoptic representation of Jesus that he is here in Mt. 28:18 made to ground the commission of his disciples upon his *authority*. It was not his way to seek results by the assertion of personal claims. He believed himself to be the Messiah, but never either in his public relations or in relation to his own chosen apostles did he put this claim forward as a reason why men should hear and do his word. His way was to reveal and enforce the truth, and trust to its own divine power to bring men into fellowship with him. It is therefore distinctly unlike Jesus to make his *authority*, whether on earth or in heaven, the reason why his disciples should go out and disciple all the nations. His principle is expressed rather in the word, "Freely ye received, freely give" (Mt. 10:8). It is the *nature* of his disciples, since they are the "leaven" of the kingdom (Mt. 13:33), to work for its extension. As children of God they *must* live in his spirit, showing mercy and doing good as did the Son of Man who came to minister (Mk. 10:45).

Once more, had Jesus given his eleven apostles an explicit command to go forth to all the nations, it would be difficult indeed to explain why they clung to Jerusalem and to the ministry to their own people, difficult to explain why even Peter must be instructed by a vision before he would take the Gospel into a Gentile home. A clear and positive word from their Lord would have overcome their scruples. It would surely have been as potent with Peter as was a dream which he had difficulty in understanding (Acts 10:17).

Finally, it is quite foreign to the synoptic representation of Jesus to suppose that he instituted baptism after he was risen from the dead. There is not in the synoptists a single allusion to baptism as associated with entrance into the circle of Christ's followers. Not only so, but there is explicit teaching to the effect that men become members of the Kingdom of God on the fulfilment of cer-

tain *spiritual* conditions.¹ It is impossible to believe that Jesus said nothing to his disciples about baptism while with them in the flesh, and then, after the resurrection, while with them in such a manner that some even doubted his presence (Mt. 28:17), instructed them to baptize their converts. The synoptic record of the earthly ministry of Jesus is unanimously and absolutely opposed to the genuineness of this alleged post-resurrection teaching on baptism. And we could scarcely say less if we should look at apostolic practice. For that practice, as described in Acts and Paul's epistles was to baptize into the name of Jesus only,² but if the eleven apostles had been positively commanded by the risen Lord to baptize into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, the custom of the early Church would be unintelligible.³

Thus every clause of this passage in Mt. 28:18-20a has against it the unbroken evidence of the *Logia* and the common tradition of the synoptic Gospels. It is intelligible as an expression of Christian belief in the latter part of the first century, and as such it must be regarded.

This survey of Matthew's peculiar material reveals in it an element⁴ which, especially in regard to the supernatural in the life of Jesus, in regard also to his person and the doctrine of the Church, is widely different from the earliest sources. The recognition of this fact is of fundamental importance for the historical understanding of our subject.

10. *Historical Value of the Various Strata of Matthew's Gospel.*

Literary analysis of the synoptic material discloses the fact that our first Gospel consists of three main deposits—the *Logia*, the narrative of Mark, and the heterogeneous matter which is peculiar to this Gospel.

¹ See, e.g., Mk. 8:34; 3:35; 10:15.

² See Acts 2:38; 16:2; Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27; Col. 2:12.

³ The practice of baptism in the early Church may have been due to the fact that it was practiced in the Messianic movement under John and that Jesus himself submitted to it.

⁴ Matthew's peculiar material is not all on the same level. Some parts of it, e.g., sections of the Sermon on the Mount, are of the highest intrinsic credibility. Thus the writer seems to have drawn from some good source besides the *Logia*.

The Aramaic *Logia* document was very probably compiled by the apostle Matthew, but of its rendering into Greek we have no knowledge. That the author of the first Gospel handled this *Logia*-material with a considerable degree of freedom has already been shown. Its essential character, however, was not altered by him, as appears from a comparative study of his version of the *Logia* with that of Luke. The historical worth of the *Logia* is attested by a variety of facts. The document contains, implicitly, a simple and self-consistent portrait of Jesus; it is without theological or speculative elements; it is in accord with the general facts of the triple tradition of Jesus' life; and by its incorporation in both of the Synoptic Gospels which aim to give a picture of Jesus not only as a teacher but also as a doer of deeds, it bears in a marked degree the *imprimatur* of the early Church. Its value therefore as a source of knowledge regarding the historical Jesus is supreme.

The second stratum of Matthew's Gospel is that element which it took from Mark. But Mark, as Papias says, was not himself a follower of the Lord, and though he may have had Peter as a chief source of his information, his narrative as a whole has not quite the same claim to authority that may be advanced for the *Logia*. Whether the *Logia* as a written document was earlier than Mark's Gospel or not, the traditional collector of the *Logia* stood nearer to Jesus. Yet Mark's narrative of the life of Jesus in distinction from his *word* is our primary document, and as far as the second stratum in Matthew's Gospel is in essential agreement with its Marcan source, it obviously has the weight of that source. Of the third element in Matthew's Gospel—the matter which is peculiar to this document—the historical value is clearly not uniform, nor the source one and the same. The small percentage of new incidents, as has already been indicated, has a color given by its supernatural element which differentiates it from the common synoptic type and marks it as of secondary worth. But the greater part of the *words* attributed to Jesus in this part of Matthew's Gospel are in essential agreement with the *Logia*, and indeed

may have been derived, at least in part, from that source.¹ In strong contrast with this element is that which was considered in the last section—those passages in Matthew's peculiar material that concern the person of Christ and those that concern the Church. In spirit and doctrine these stand at the farthest remove from the *Logia* and from the common synoptic tradition. They are thus shown to belong to the early Christian interpretation and application of the Gospel. Thus what we have called the third element of Matthew, when regarded from the point of view of its origin, splits into two parts, one of which is early, the other late. The second may be assigned to the evangelist himself.

11. *Luke's Use of Mark as a Source.*

Luke incorporates in his narrative about seventy-six per cent of the Gospel of Mark. There are thirteen passages, aggregating 140 verses, which he omits.² A probable reason can be assigned for the omission of some of these passages. Thus Luke may have omitted Mark's call of the four disciples near Capernaum (1:16-20) because he wished to use another story in his possession which was to some extent parallel (5:1-9), and he may have passed over the charge that Jesus was beside himself (3:20-21) because he was to make use of the accusation that he cast out demons by Beelzebub (11:15). A similar reason may be given in some other instances.³ It is not improbable that Luke omitted the story of feeding 4000 (Mk. 8:1-10) because he regarded it as another version of the feeding of the multitudes near Bethsaida (6:31-34). Then, again, some of the passages of Mark which Luke omits may well have seemed to him unsuitable for his Gentile readers because of their strong Jewish character, for example, the section in regard to ceremonial purity (7:1-23). It is possible that he omitted the story of the selfish wish of James and John (10:35-40) because it reflected unpleasantly on men who, when he wrote, were

¹ Thus, e.g., Holtzmann treats the *entire* Sermon on the Mount as from Q.

² 1:16-20; 3:20-21; 4:26-29; 6:19-29; 6:45-8:26; 9:9-13; 9:42-10:12; 10:35-40; 11:12-14, 20-26; 12:28-34; 13:33-37; 14:23-28; 15:1, 16-20.

³ E.g., Mk. 8:1-10, 22-26; 13:33-37; 15:16-20.

held in high esteem throughout the Church. Thus there seems to be no difficulty in supposing that Luke, though he does not give certain sections of Mark's narrative, had the entire Gospel before him.

As regards the Marcan *order* of narrating the events in the life of Jesus, it was adopted by Luke even more largely than was Mark's material. There are only ten points at which he departs from the order of the earlier Gospel, and two of these are not incidents but parables.¹ Thus, as regards the general framework of the life of Jesus, Mark's narrative had a determinative influence on Luke. This writer was obviously not satisfied with Mark's Gospel as a whole, but it is equally plain that he had no radical criticism to make on Mark's order.

But although Luke's use of Mark as a source was thus comprehensive in respect both to the matter and the order, his formal reproduction of the Marcan material was characterized by great freedom. As a Greek of cultivated literary tastes he recast the somewhat rough un-Hellenic speech of the narrative before him. He chose Greek words for Mark's occasional Aramaic and Latin terms,² and in place of Mark's simple verbs he frequently sets the more suggestive compound ones.³ He transformed into select speech the provincial, common or vulgar language of his source. He also abbreviated or expanded, as he saw fit. How he used his Marcan source in this respect brief study of a single concrete case will indicate. For this purpose we take the story of the Gerasene demoniac (Mk. 5:1-20; Lk. 8:26-39), though almost any other passage would serve as well. Mark says of Jesus and his disciples that they "came" to the country of the Gerasenes, Luke says they "sailed down" there; Mark that they came to the "other side," Luke that they came to the other side of the "lake," and adds that the region to which they came was "over against Galilee." The demoniac who met them as they disembarked was, accord-

¹ The Lucan references are 3:19-20; 4:16; 5:1-11; 6:12-16; 8:4-8, 19-21; 13:18-19; 18:15-17; 22:15-20, 31-34.

² For example, ἀληθώς instead of ἀμήν, φόρος instead of κῆνσος, δύο λεπτά instead of κοδράντης.

³ See, e.g., 4:42; 8:6; 9:47; 18:22; 19:36; 20:10 with the Marcan parallels.

ing to Mark, "in an unclean spirit"—whatever he may have meant by this phrase; Luke says that he "had demons." Mark represents the demoniac as saying to Jesus "I adjure thee," but Luke, as though thinking this term somewhat unsuited to such a creature in his approach to Jesus, lets him say "I *pray* thee." When Mark changes abruptly and without apparent reason from an historical tense to the present, Luke consistently uses the historical tense.¹ The demon says, according to Mark, "My name is legion, for *we* are many;" but Luke, to avoid this obscure passing from the singular to the plural, lets the man's answer be simply "Legion," and then adds in way of explanation, "for many demons had entered into him." And finally, where Mark relates that the demoniac besought Jesus that he would not send *them* out of the country, Luke lets the request come from the demons themselves, and then, in place of the Jewish conception that the demons might not like to leave that particular region—perhaps because it was wild and rocky and largely inhabited by Gentiles, Luke substitutes the classical conception of the "abyss."

These are not all the modifications that Luke makes in the brief passage, but they are the chief, and sufficiently illustrate the point that he freely expanded or abbreviated his source.

One important fact remains to be noted in Luke's relation to Mark as a source, namely, that his freedom in modifying the *words* of Jesus in his Marcan source is perceptibly more limited than his freedom in handling the narrative sections. Speaking only in approximate terms and with the distinct admission that it is difficult to state this literary difference arithmetically, we may say that where Luke departs once from Mark's version of *words* of Jesus, he departs twice from Mark's *narrative*. We speak now of departures which affect the sense, for in regard to literary form alone Luke rarely leaves Mark's version of words of Jesus *wholly* unchanged. The greater freedom with which he handles the narrative parts

¹ See, e.g., Mk. 5:9; 8:3. Hawkins, in work cited, pp. 144-149, gives a list of 151 historical presents in Mk., 78 in Mt. and 4 (or 6) in Lk.

of his source is an indication that he did not feel for these quite the same reverence that he felt for Mark's version of the Master's sayings.

12. *Luke's Use of the Logia as a Source.*

The first point that invites attention in a survey of Luke's use of the *Logia* is the manner in which he introduces various words of Jesus. There are not less than ten instances in which he either gives an historical introduction to a saying of Jesus or sets it in a connection which is preferable to that in which Matthew puts it. Some of these cases are of great interest and importance, and in most of them at least it seems quite certain that Luke did not furnish the introduction out of his own sense of the fitness of things as Thucydides composed the speeches which he put on the lips of various characters in his great history, but drew from some historical source, presumably from the *Logia* itself. When the author of the first Gospel decided to group the sayings of Jesus according to their content, he was obliged to ignore the hints which his source gave in regard to the occasion of each individual saying. Luke may not always have found the sayings of the *Logia* associated with a definite occasion, indeed it is improbable that such can have been the case, and furthermore he may not in every instance have followed the hints which his document contained, for he appears always to have considered it his duty to exercise his own judgment in dealing with his sources, but the instances in which he furnishes the words of Jesus with a fitting occasion are so many and the setting so suitable that it would be unwarrantable to conclude that he did not find these data in the *Logia*.

The significance of his attitude toward the *Logia* in this respect can be indicated by a glance at the passages in question. He teaches that the Lord's Prayer was given in response to a request of some disciples who were familiar with the Baptist's example, and not on the initiative of Jesus (Mt. 6:9; Lk. 11:1). The saying about a narrow gate and a wide one was occasioned, according to Luke (13:23), by the query of a certain

one, "Lord, are they few that are saved?" The solemn word concerning those who in the judgment will say: "We did eat and drink in thy presence, and thou didst teach in our streets," is put by Luke (13:26) much later than the Sermon on the Mount where it is found in Matthew, as is also the saying, "The harvest is plenteous but the laborers are few" (Lk. 10:2), which obviously does not suit the day when the Twelve were first sent forth in Galilee, for at that time one could hardly have said so much as that there were even a "few" Christian laborers. The word of Jesus that his disciples should put him higher than father and mother, and that they should follow him, each bearing his own cross, was spoken, according to Luke (14:25), when a multitude were following him and after the outcome of his career was clear to his thought, and the word is more intelligible as spoken on this occasion than when regarded as a part of the message given to the Twelve when they were sent out in Galilee. The Great Confession, which in Matthew is out of connection with the foregoing narrative (11:25), has in Luke (10:21) a clear historical motive. Again, the parable of the Great Supper which, according to Matthew (22:1-14), was given by Jesus on his own initiative, has in Luke a definite and most suitable setting (14:15-24). The saying about the Faithful Steward was occasioned, Luke tells us (12:41), by a question of Peter, and the parable of the Minas (19:11-27) is said to have been spoken as Jesus and the Twelve were going up to Jerusalem with the caravan for the last Passover, when there was an expectation that the kingdom of heaven was about to appear.

The inference that seems to be justified by the foregoing data is that we have greater fidelity to the *Logia* in Luke than in Matthew.¹ But this inference is confirmed, it seems to me, by the analysis of the Lucan form of separate sayings of Jesus as compared with the form in Matthew. There are many sayings in regard to which

¹Hawkins, p. 112, regards the question whether Matthew or Luke was the more faithful to the *Logia* as "unsolved and probably insoluble." Soltau, *Unsere Evangelien ihre Quellen und ihr Quellen werth*, 1901, holds that Luke had a different collection of *Logia* from Matthew, perhaps a Jewish-Christian edition.

no attempt will here be made to decide between the Matthaean and the Lucan version.¹ There is at least one—there are more in the judgment of some writers—of which Luke's version appears less satisfactory than Matthew's. This is 11:13 (Mt. 7:11). In Matthew the passage on Prayer closes with the words, "How much more shall your Father who is in heaven give good things to those who ask him?" but the Lucan conclusion is, "How much more shall your heavenly Father give a *holy spirit* (πνεῦμα ἅγιον) to those who ask him?" Now as Jesus, according to both writers, is not contrasting *gifts* but *givers*, Luke's introduction of "holy spirit" where Matthew has "good things" may not improbably show the influence of a time when the doctrine of the Spirit had come to have a much larger place in Christian thought than it had in the synoptic words of Jesus.

But over against this single passage there is a considerable number of others in which Luke's version is favored by the internal evidence and by its congruity with the general character of the synoptic teaching of Jesus. These must now be briefly considered.

Of the Lucan form of the Lord's Prayer we have spoken in a previous paragraph. Luke's version of the story about a centurion at Capernaum whose servant Jesus healed (7:1-10) takes precedence of that in Matthew (8:5-13). For, in the first place, it is intrinsically probable that a *Gentile* who wished to secure a favor from the Jewish teacher and healer would have sent *Jewish* friends to present his request, as Luke says was the case. The centurion must have known how averse the Jews were to any association with Gentiles, and Jesus had not as yet been known to have any dealing whatever with foreigners. Again, the passage in Matthew, since its chief aim is to warn *Jews*, is not especially suited to the preceding context, while its parallel in Luke stands in another connection with which it fully accords. In both these points then the Lucan form of the incident commends itself.

¹ For example, Mt. 6:27=Lk. 12:25; Mt. 11:12=Lk. 16:16; Mt. 10:15=Lk. 10:12; Mt. 10:28=Lk. 12:4; Mt. 8:21=Lk. 9:59.

Passing by the saying about the "sign of Jonah," the double version of which has already been discussed in another connection, we come to Luke 10:23-24. The hour in which this word was spoken was that when the disciples returned with the joyous message regarding their power over demons (10:17) and when Jesus thanked the Father for what he had revealed to the disciples. Jesus then said to his followers, "Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see: for I say unto you, that many prophets and kings desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not." This saying suits the context. The disciples are congratulated by the Master on their opportunities, which prophets and kings had desired in vain. But Matthew forces the saying into an entirely different context. Jesus had just told his disciples why he spoke to the multitudes in parables (13:10), and then he congratulated them that they in contrast to the multitude had *seeing* eyes and *hearing* ears. This word was followed by the thought of the present opportunity, the same thought as in Luke. Thus the version of Matthew embodies ideas that are not accordant. The disciples are contrasted with prophets and righteous men of the past, yet these did not lack seeing eyes and hearing ears: what *they* lacked was a vision of God's fulfilment of his promise. Thus the thought of Luke 10:23-24 has suffered change in Matthew to suit it to a different occasion.

The introduction to the saying of Lk. 14:26 has already been noticed. This saying in itself appears worthy to be called the original rather than that of Matthew's parallel (10:37). Luke says, "If any one cometh unto me and *hateth* not his father and mother" etc., but Matthew gives what may be regarded as an interpretation of this hard word, for he says, "He that *loveth* father or mother *more* than me is not worthy of me." Had this been the form of the saying in the *Logia* it is hardly probable that any one would have changed it into the Lucan expression, but this Lucan expression, on the contrary, might easily have taken the softened form of Matthew.

When speaking of Matthew's freedom in handling the *Logia* the parable of the Great Supper or King's Wedding Feast was considered, and perhaps it is not needful to say more of that passage, though the secondary character of Matthew might be more strongly stated. We will pass on to the parable of the Minas (Lk. 19:11-27) and its parallel in Matthew (25:14-30). The general purpose of the two narratives is identical and the method in both is the same. The kingdom is not to appear at once, and in the meantime the disciples are given service in the interest of their absent Lord. It is a time of testing, and will be followed by awards suited to each one's faithfulness to his trust. Thus the two passages are apparently variants of one original, and only by their analysis can it be determined which may claim to be nearer to the *Logia*. Here as in preceding cases the historical introduction is not without significance. The fact that Luke gives an intelligible setting of the parable favors his version of it. But there are also other points which speak for the greater originality of his form of the parable. There is first its greater simplicity and clearness. The servant who gains ten minas is appointed over ten cities and he who gains five is set over five cities. The award is proportionate to the achievement; and it is also intelligible. In Matthew, on the other hand, the man who handles five talents receives the same award as the one who handles but two, and a part of their common award is indefinite and unsuitable from the parable's business point of view. That is the invitation, "Enter into the joy of thy Lord." But this is vague. Does it mean that the faithful servant is summoned to a permanent place in the household of his lord and to a share in all his personal comforts? Would that, however, be supported by any known facts out of the business life of Palestine in the time of Jesus? Probably we are to see here a reflection of the Christian hope that the faithful disciple will share in the *heavenly glory* of Christ. If so, then this passage as compared with the simpler conception in Luke must be regarded as later and secondary. A reference to the Christian's *future* reward may easily

be understood as an interpretative modification of the original parable, but it obviously cannot be regarded as germane to the story itself, which is taken from the business world.

Again, the treatment of the unprofitable servant in the Lucan version is more congruous with the general tenor of the parable than is his treatment in the version of Matthew. For in Luke his judgment consists simply in the withdrawal of the unused mina, while in Matthew he not only loses the money entrusted to him but is "cast out into the outer darkness" where there is "the weeping and the gnashing of teeth." Manifestly this symbolism does not suit the sphere of *business* relations to which the parable belongs. It is the symbolism which in the first Gospel is always associated with the final judgment of men.¹ But this blending of two distinct spheres of thought in one parable must be regarded as secondary in comparison with the simple conclusion in Luke.

The data which have now been considered seem to confirm the inference drawn from Luke's introductions to various sayings of Jesus, namely, that he has preserved the *Logia* in a purer form than that of Matthew.

13. *Luke's Peculiar Material.*

Of the 1149 verses in the Gospel according to Luke about 398, or a little more than one-third, are his own. A little more than a quarter of this peculiar material (113 vs.) concerns events that were prior to the public ministry of Jesus—namely, the birth and preaching of John the Baptist, the birth and childhood of Jesus; and a little less than one quarter of it (97 vs.) consists of parables. Luke has eight² parables in common with Mark and Matthew or with Matthew alone, aggregating 62 verses, and has thirteen³ as his own peculiar property. On the other hand, he has fourteen miraculous incidents

¹ See Mt. 8:12; 13:42, 50; 22:13; 24:51.

² The Sower, The Mustard Seed, The Vineyard, The Leaven, The Lost Sheep, The Great Supper, The Servants, and The Minas.

³ The Merciful Samaritan, The Importunate Friend, The Rich Fool, The Fig Tree, The Tower-Builders, The King, The Lost Coin, The Lost Son, The Steward, The Rich Man and Lazarus, The Judge, The Pharisee and Publican, and The Unprofitable Servants.

in common with both Mark and Matthew, one in common with Mark alone, but only *six*¹ such incidents peculiar to his own narrative. And these miraculous incidents, with one exception which is confined to a single verse (22:51), do not depart in character from the common synoptic type. Thus it appears that Luke's peculiar matter, as far as the public career of Jesus is concerned, consists predominantly of teaching.

With this general survey of the subject we will now consider some details as indicating the author's interests and tendencies.

He informs Theophilus (1:3) that he has traced the course of all things accurately "from the first," and this phrase taken in the light of the first two chapters of his narrative may be referred to the origin and early life of Jesus and of his forerunner. The Gospel of Mark which he had as one of his chief sources had nothing to say on these origins and possibly seemed to Luke defective on that very ground. At any rate, the fact that he devotes one-ninth of his entire narrative to the birth of John and Jesus, with three events belonging to the infancy and childhood of the latter, is evidence that he counted these things important for Theophilus.

When we come to the ministry of Jesus and survey Luke's peculiar material, we find that it presents incident after incident and saying after saying which set forth from varying points of view the broad and tender sympathy of Jesus. The author seems to have been fascinated by his hero's noble humanity. Thus he preserves a parable that sets the tax-gatherer above the proud Pharisee (18:9-14) and records how Jesus lodged with a chief publican (19:1-10). On his pages the despised Samaritan is exalted. He appears to narrate the story of the cure of ten lepers for the sake of the fact that the only one of the ten who returned to give thanks to Jesus was a Samaritan (11:11-19). He records that Jesus rebuked his disciples because they were disposed to destroy the Samaritan village which refused entertainment

¹ Simon's Catch of Fish, The Widow of Nain, The Deformed Woman, Case of Dropsy, Ten Lepers, The Servant's Ear.

to their Master (9:51-56), and he preserves the great parable in which a Samaritan is held up as an example of true neighborliness (10:29-37).

A unique place in his narrative is held by women, another class in the society of that day and land who were not given the honor they deserved. It is Luke who tells us that certain women ministered of their substance to Jesus and the Twelve (8:1-13), and who gives us the priceless miniature of the scene in the home of Mary and Martha (10:38-42); Luke who records the enthusiastic salutation of a woman who had been deeply impressed by the words of Jesus (11:27-28), and Luke who rescued from oblivion two parables whose chief actor is a woman (15:8-10; 18:1-8); finally, it is Luke who sheds a ray of light on the procession to Golgotha by the word about those women who followed Jesus with lamentation (23:27-29). Other details in Luke's peculiar material which may be regarded as touches helping to perfect his portrayal of the humane and sympathetic character of Jesus are the statement that he wept over Jerusalem (19:41) and that a mere look from him melted Peter's obdurate heart (22:61).

We cannot doubt that Luke, who was little interested in the miraculous element in the stories of Jesus, was profoundly moved by what he learned of the depth and universality of the Master's sympathy. Indeed, it appears as though in at least two of his stories of miraculous help Luke was impressed not by the miraculous incident as such but by the revelation of the sympathetic nature of Jesus which it afforded. Thus, in his portrayal of what occurred near the town of Nain (7:11-17) he tells us that the woman whose son was being carried to burial was a *widow* and that it was her *only* son who lay upon the bier. When the son sat up and began to speak, Luke says that Jesus "gave him to his mother." Apparently the crown of the story for him was that it revealed the heart of Jesus. So in the story of the deformed woman (13:10-17) Jesus seems to have been moved not by any request but by clear pity for one who had long been "bound by Satan."

We have to assume that Luke in gathering and testing the material which is peculiar to his narrative proceeded with the same care and the same freedom which we see illustrated in his use of Mark's Gospel and the *Logia*. That this material has not all the like claim to acceptance is obvious from a comparison of it with the *Logia* and with the common or triple tradition. Every part of it must be weighed in this manner in order to determine its intrinsic value. For the present, where we are considering in a general manner Luke's peculiar material, it is needful only to illustrate the statement that its claim to acceptance is not uniform, or, in other words, that his sources were not all of equal historical worth.

Take for instance the story of the boy Jesus in the temple at twelve years of age (2:40-52) and the story of Zacchaeus the chief publican of Jericho (19:1-10). In the latter there is not even a detail which is at variance with the teaching of the common tradition in regard to Jesus' relation toward publicans or their relation to him. And the words that Jesus speaks are in harmony with the *Logia*. Thus the story stands the documentary test of historicity. Quite different is it with the story of the boy Jesus in the temple. It is neither intrinsically probable nor is it congruous with the fundamental documents. It is not intrinsically probable. The boy who was already full of wisdom and on whom the grace of God rested (2:40), the boy who went back to Nazareth and was subject to his parents, would hardly have been willing to cause them two days of needless searching and anxiety. Further, it is difficult to suppose that at one moment Jesus felt that he *must* be in the things of his Father and the next left them without a word and returned to Nazareth. But, again, the story is not congruous with the fundamental documents, and that in two points: First, the portrait of Jesus as contained both in the *Logia* and the common tradition of the synoptists is against the view that he had ever associated the "things of the Father" in a pre-eminent degree with hearing the doctors and asking them questions; and second, the synoptic tradition, which dates from the baptism of Jesus his sense of standing in a

unique relation to the Father, is against this word of Luke which attributes even to the boy of twelve years a sense of unique relationship to God.

Or take as a second illustration the two Lucan parables of the Lost Son and the Rich Man and Lazarus (16:19-31; 19:1-10). The teaching of the former is felt to be in vital accord with the purpose of the whole life of Jesus. In portraying the father's treatment of his lost child Jesus portrayed his own feeling toward publicans and sinners, which he believed to be in deepest harmony with God's feeling toward them. But on the other hand, the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus is not congruous with the thought of Jesus as contained in the common tradition and the *Logia*. It departs from it notably in two points. First, it subordinates character to outward condition as a factor determining one's future state. Lazarus, because he received "evil things" on earth, that is, because he was a beggar and full of sores, came at last to "Abraham's bosom." Not a word is said of his character. And in the case of the rich man, nothing is said of his selfish neglect of Lazarus. It seems to be a sufficient reason why he reaps anguish beyond the grave that "in his lifetime" he had received his "good things." But this is a materialistic Jewish¹ conception and not the ethical view of Jesus, who in all his teaching laid stress on the determinative character of the inner and spiritual as against the outer and material.

Second, this parable seems to be out of accord with the general habit of Jesus in his references to the future, for it goes into much detail, while the manner of Jesus as witnessed elsewhere was one of great reserve. Thus it is here only that we find the figure of "Abraham's bosom," here only the word "torments," here only "anguish" and the "flame," here only the conception of two compartments in Hades, here only the "great gulf" (*χάσμα*) that cannot be passed, here only that the spirits of departed men are represented as speaking, and here only that there is reference to the witness of one who had risen from the dead.

¹ See Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 322.

But while, as these illustrations show, Luke's own peculiar matter has not all the like claim to acceptance, yet taken as a whole and judged in the light of the *Logia* and of the common synoptic tradition, it must be given a place among our most valuable sources of knowledge on the life and teaching of Jesus.

CHAPTER II

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

14. *Agreement of the Fourth Gospel with the Synoptists.*

(a) *In the Narrative.* In the triple tradition of the synoptists, beginning with the Baptist's activity and continuing up to the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, there are approximately thirty-five events narrated. Of these the Gospel of John has three, namely, the activity of a forerunner by the name of John, the return of Jesus into Galilee after his meeting with the Baptist, and the feeding of five thousand people on the east side of the lake of Galilee.¹ To these should be added the descent of the Dove upon Jesus (1:32), which constitutes a part of one of the thirty-five events. In the double tradition of Matthew and Luke we may count seven² incidents belonging to this same period, and of these John has one, that is, if we regard his story of a king's officer (4:46-54) as a variant form of the synoptic centurion of Capernaum. In the double tradition of Mark and Matthew there are eight³ incidents, of which John has one (6:16-21). The double tradition of Mark and Luke contains three incidents,⁴ all wanting in John.

In the single tradition of the various synoptists we count approximately fifteen⁵ incidents, of which not one is found in John.

¹ 1:5, 26; 1:43; 6:5.

² John's preaching to the multitude (Mt. 3:1-12), Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 5-7), the Centurion at Capernaum (Mt. 8:5-13), Message from the Baptist (Mt. 11:2-6), Demand for Signs (Mt. 12:38-42), Woes on Galilean cities (Mt. 11:20-24), and the case of would-be Disciples (Mt. 8:19-22).

³ The Call of Four (Mk. 1:16-20), Walking on the Lake (6:45-52), Return to Genesaret (6:53-56), Washing of Hands (7:1-23), Canaanitish Woman (7:24-30), Journey through Tyre and Sidon (7:31-37), Feeding 4000 (8:1-10), and Departure from Galilee (10:11).

⁴ Day in Capernaum (Mk. 1:21-28), Flight of Jesus (1:35-38), and Unknown Worker (9:38-41).

⁵ Coin in Fish's Mouth (Mt.), Attempt by Family of Jesus (Mk.), Blind Man of Bethsaida (Mk.), Simon's Catch (Lk.), Ten Lepers (Lk.), Deformed

When, however, we pass to the last week of the life of Jesus the case is different. Now, instead of having but little of the synoptic narrative, John has the larger part of it. Out of some twenty events common to the story of all the synoptists John has thirteen. If we omit the five controversies with the leaders,¹ which might be reckoned with the teaching sections rather than with the strictly biographical material, then all but two of the fifteen synoptic incidents of this period are found in John.

Thus it appears that of the entire synoptic narrative from the work of the Baptist to the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem John has less than eight per cent, while of the narrative concerning the last week he has about eighty-six per cent.

(b) *In the Teaching of Jesus.* Here we have to notice first the agreement between John and the synoptists as regards *form*. In the triple tradition of the synoptists there are approximately 180 verses which consist, in whole or in part, of words of Jesus. Of these the Gospel of John has but three verses (13:21, 38; 18:37).² The *Logia* as preserved in Matthew and Luke contained about 200 verses, and of these John has one (13:16; 15:20). Outside these two fundamental elements of the synoptic Gospels there are a very few sayings or significant terms which we meet again in John. Thus Jesus speaks here to Philip (1:43), as to certain men in the synoptists (e.g., Mk. 2:14), saying, "Follow me." Here, as in the synoptists, he speaks of "seeing" and of "entering" the kingdom of heaven (3:3, 5). Here, as in Mark and Matthew, we have the proverbial saying about a prophet in his own country (4:44), here the same words to a sick man (5:8) which we have elsewhere, "Arise, take up thy bed and walk" (e.g., Mk. 2:11). As in Mark and Matthew, so in John we have the saying, "For the poor

Woman (Lk.), Dropsical Man (Lk.), Woman's Salutation (Lk.), Youth of Nain (Lk.), Seventy Disciples (Lk.), Departure from Perea (?) (Lk.), Samaritan Village (Lk.), Ministering Women (Lk.), Mary and Martha (Lk.), Zacchaeus (Lk.).

¹ Mk. 11:27; 12:13; 12:18; 12:28; 12:35.

² The synoptic word about "losing" life and "finding" it (Mk. 8:35) has a substantial parallel in John, where "loving" and "hating" are substituted for "losing" and "finding" (12:25).

ye have always with you, but me ye have not always" (12:8). As in Matthew, so in John we have the word, "He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me" (13:20). John has much the same announcement of the traitor (13:18) as have Matthew and Mark, and essentially the same word about the scattering of the disciples at Jesus' death (16:32).

Thus it appears that of the words of Jesus in the two fundamental strata of the synoptists John has a little more than one per cent, and of other sayings of Jesus he has less than a dozen. Yet the Gospel of John, exclusive of the last chapter, has about 404 verses which are ascribed to Jesus, a percentage of the entire Gospel somewhat larger than his words make in Luke's Gospel. When therefore we have regard to the *form* of the teaching of Jesus—that is, the very words used—it is seen that what John has in common with the first three or with any one or two of them is *very slight*.

But, secondly, we have to enquire how far John agrees with the synoptists as regards the *content* of the Master's teaching. Here it is less easy to speak in exact terms, for his teaching both according to the synoptists and John is many-sided and profound, but nevertheless some approximation to the truth may be reached. In John as in the synoptists we have, then, in the first place, the fatherhood of God, a universal fatherhood of love,¹ and we have the two claims of Jesus that he has a unique knowledge of the Father² and that he is the Messiah (4:26). Also in what Jesus says of his work there is a certain agreement between John and the synoptists. Thus, it is the prerogative of the Son, according to John (5:21; 10:10), to give life, and this—his supreme function—may be regarded as closely akin to that which is claimed in the synoptists, namely, that he can give a perfect *knowledge* of the Father (Mt. 11:27). Further, as in John Jesus is himself the bread of life (6:35), so in the synoptists the bread which he gives to his disciples on the

¹ E.g., 4:21, 23; 10:29; 3:16.

² 7:29; 10:15.

last evening in some way represents his body (e.g., Mk. 14:22). Again, in John as in the synoptists Jesus speaks of his life as being in some respects an exemplar to his disciples. He washes their feet, they ought to wash one another's feet (13:14-15); he came to serve, they too must serve (Mk. 10:44-45). In John, as in the synoptists, Jesus protests against the profanation of the temple,¹ and according to both sources he uttered some dark saying about the temple's overthrow.² In John, as in the synoptists, he accuses the Jews of transgressing the Law;³ in both he lays stress on *doing* his word;⁴ and in both he warns his disciples that they will have to meet persecution, as he has.⁵ Finally, in John, as in the synoptists, Jesus speaks of a meeting with his disciples after the impending separation by death.⁶

It is obvious at once that the agreement of John with the synoptists as regards the *content* of the teaching of Jesus is far more extensive than the agreement as to the form and letter. In one case the agreement is almost a negligible quantity, in the other it is broad and deep. But so far we have touched only one side of the relationship of these writings to each other, and that not the most striking or most important.

15. *Departures of the Fourth Gospel from the Synoptists.*

A clear and comprehensive survey of the departures of the Fourth Gospel from the Synoptists is necessary to a true judgment of this great work and of its author's aim. In presenting this feature of the book we shall notice briefly nine conspicuous points.

1. *John the Baptist.* According to the synoptists, John was a mighty preacher of repentance, and announced one greater than himself who was soon to appear in Israel. He baptized Jesus, but later, when in prison, sent to ask whether he was "the coming one" (Mt. 11:3). Jesus, while recognizing John as his forerunner and confessing his greatness, said that he was less than the least

¹ John 2:19; Mk. 11:17.

² Mt. 26:61; 27:40; John 2:19.

³ John 7:19; Mt. 23:23.

⁴ John 13:17; Mt. 7:24.

⁵ John 15:20; 16:2; Mt. 10:25, 28.

⁶ John 16:16, 22; Mk. 14:28; 16:7.

in the kingdom of heaven—a word called forth by John's failure to see in the ministry of Jesus the fulfilment of Israel's hope.

But in the Gospel of John, the exclusive mission of the Baptist is to bear witness to Jesus (1:7, 31). He declares that Jesus was "before" him, that is to say, pre-existed (1:15, 30); that he was the Son of God (1:34); and the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world (1:29, 36). Jesus is represented as saying that John's witness of him was true (5:32). There is, accordingly, no room in the Fourth Gospel for the Baptist's doubt regarding the Messiahship of Jesus, which is reported in the synoptists, nor does this Gospel allow it to be said of him that he was less than the least in the kingdom of heaven. On the contrary, according to the Fourth Gospel, he has in a preëminent degree just that which constitutes one a member of that kingdom.

2. *The Descent of the Spirit upon Jesus.* The significance of this descent of the Spirit was for Jesus himself, according to the synoptists, though Matthew allows John the Baptist also to hear the heavenly voice. In John, on the other hand, the significance of the event was primarily for the Baptist (1:31-34), being a sign previously given to him by God whereby he should recognize Jesus as the one who was to baptize with the Spirit. He it was who saw the Spirit's descent, and there is no suggestion in John's narrative that the event was of critical importance for Jesus, or, even that Jesus was baptized by John.

3. *The Scene of Jesus' Ministry.* The Fourth Gospel, like the synoptists, represents Jesus as returning from the interview with the Baptist into Galilee (1:43; 2:1), but from this point forward it differs from them in its geographical outline of the Lord's career. For in the synoptists, Galilee is the field to which Jesus devotes himself until near the close of his ministry when he visits Perea, and afterward, a few days before his death, goes to Jerusalem. They have no clear trace of any second visit in the capital after the beginning of his public work.¹

¹ The words "how often" of Mt. 23:37; Lk. 13:34, even if they are words of Jesus and not rather, as Schmiedel thinks (see *The Johannine*

They also represent Capernaum as the center of the activity of Jesus, the place where he was "at home" (e.g., Mk. 2:1). But according to John, Jesus abides only a few days in Capernaum on his first visit (2:12), and his second visit there, which is also the last, appears to have been equally short (6:16-17; 7:1). His entire stay in Galilee is covered by three passages,² two of which are brief and concerned with events in Cana, which is not mentioned in the synoptists. On the other hand, Jerusalem is now the proper field of the activity of Jesus,³ and the temple occupies much the same place that Capernaum has in the synoptists (e.g., 18:20). The land of Judea is visited by him,⁴ and Samaria as well (4:5-42), though according to the Synoptists he forbade the Twelve to go into any city of the Samaritans (Mt. 10:5) and said of himself on another occasion, "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt. 15:24).

It is doubtless true that each of the Gospel narratives is fragmentary, and it is conceivable that one writer should have concerned himself especially with Galilean incidents and another with the Judean, but in that case their narratives ought to be adjustable one to the other. But John's representation of the scene of the ministry of Jesus seems to exclude that of the synoptists. It leaves no room for a long Galilean ministry, which resulted in the popular rejection of Jesus. It seems impossible to regard it as *supplementing* the synoptists in regard to the scene of the ministry of Jesus. It gives us not a supplement but a contrast. Moreover, the geographical dissonance is closely bound up with other dissonances, and cannot be judged apart by itself. The difficulty in removing it is increased as we go from point to point of the Johannine story.

4. *The Mighty Works of Jesus.* The ministry of Jesus, according to the synoptists, included from the very first

Writings, 1908, pp. 60-61), a quotation from the *Wisdom of God*, wrongly attributed to him, modify the verb ἠθέλησεν; but the wish to help the Jerusalemites does not necessarily imply the presence in Jerusalem of the wisher.

² 2:1-12; 4:43-54; 6:1-7:10.

³ See 2:13-3:21; 5:1-47; 7:14-10:39; 12:12-20:29.

⁴ 3:22; 7:1; 11:54.

some attention to the sick and especially to demoniacs. In the triple tradition twelve mighty works are described, of which nine are cures of disease. In the same source we read a charge of the scribes that Jesus cast out demons by Beelzebub (Mk. 3:22)—an admission that they were indeed cast out by him, and we read also that Jesus, on sending out the Twelve, gave them authority over unclean spirits (Mk. 6:7). We may say then that, according to the synoptists, the typical mighty work of Jesus was the cure of the sick. But in John the "beginning of the signs" of Jesus is the change of water into wine (2:9). Six other signs follow and all are remarkable in the highest degree. Three sick folk are healed—one without visiting him (4:46), another who had been lame 38 years (5:5), and the third a man who was born blind (9:1). The remaining miracles are the feeding of the multitude (6:5), walking on the sea (6:19), and the raising of Lazarus (11:43). Thus the most conspicuous synoptic work of Jesus—the casting out of demons—does not appear at all in John, and the works which we find there are uniformly of an astounding character.

Furthermore, the prevailing attitude of Jesus toward "signs" in the Fourth Gospel is radically different from his attitude toward works of healing in the synoptists. When the Jews ask, "What sign showest thou unto us?" (2:18) Jesus does not rebuke them and declare that no sign shall be given, as he does on a similar occasion in the synoptists.¹ From the author's point of view Jesus could not well *refuse* signs since by them he "manifested his glory" (2:11) and through them the disciples were led to believe on him (20:31). This different attitude of Jesus toward signs is seen clearly in the case of the man who was born blind and in the case of Lazarus. In the former, the miracle illustrated the word which Jesus had just spoken, "I am the light of the world" (9:5), and in the latter it is a symbolic utterance of the truth of the Master's word, "I am the resurrection and the life" (11:25). Of this significant conception of miracles the synoptists have no trace.

¹ See Mt. 12:39; Mk. 8:12; Lk. 11:29.

Again, it is to be noted that, in the synoptists, the mighty works of Jesus are habitually wrought at the solicitation of the suffering,¹ they show the compassion of Jesus,² and are evidence of the presence of the kingdom of God;³ but in John Jesus habitually proceeds on his *own* initiative in working miracles,⁴ and they are, for the author, a manifestation of the glorious *nature* of Jesus (1:14; 17:24), a supreme proof that he is the Son of God (20:31).

5. *The Mutual Relation of Jesus and his People.* In the synoptists Jesus is confronted by several classes of varying social and official rank. From early in the Galilean ministry (Mk. 2:6) he is watched by scribes and associates with publicans and "sinners." And his relations with these classes are sometimes of great importance for the course of his work. But in John the scribes do not once appear, neither do publicans and "sinners." Again, in the synoptists, but especially in Mark, there is a clearly traceable *development* both of faith in Jesus and of hostility toward him; but in John both forms of development are wanting. The earliest disciples here recognize Jesus as the Messiah at their first meeting (1:41) and even the Baptist has full insight into his character and mission (1:29). Furthermore, hostility toward him appears as soon as he comes forward publicly (2:18). This hostility is shown not by Pharisees and Herodians, as in the synoptists, but by the "Jews"—a term which occurs more than sixty times in John. This is found in the synoptists also, but never as a designation of the *enemies* of Jesus (e.g., Mk. 7:3).

Now both the disappearance of such concrete facts as the scribes, the publicans and the "sinners," and on the other hand the emergence of the thought of *national* opposition call attention to the marked change of atmosphere which is found as one passes from the synoptists into John.

¹ See, e.g., Mk. 1:31, 32, 40; 2:3; 5:23; 7:26, 32; 8:22; 9:17, etc.

² Mk. 8:2; Mt. 14:14; 15:32; 20:34.

³ E.g., Lk. 11:20.

⁴ See 2:7; 5:6; 6:5; 9:6; 11:3, 34.

6. *The Teaching of Jesus.* A word only in regard to the obvious *literary* difference between the synoptic and the Johannine teaching of Jesus. According to the synoptists Jesus loved to speak in parables, and it is in this form that his thought of God and the heavenly kingdom is most fully set forth, but in John there is no parable, the passages about the Door and the Sheep Fold, the Branch and the Vine, being of the nature of allegory. Again, according to the synoptists the sayings of Jesus are terse, epigrammatic and pictorial, and are clearly distinct from the accompanying narrative; but in John the literary style of Jesus is not different from that of the writer, and instead of the short, vigorous and often paradoxical sayings of the synoptists with a background of nature and human life we have long, repetitious discourses with a philosophical background.

But when we go deeper, into the teaching itself, John's departure from the synoptists is no less remarkable. Thus the Kingdom of God, which has been called the *theme* of Jesus' teaching according to the synoptists, appears in John on but two occasions and one of these was private (3:3, 5; 18:36). Life, on the other hand, and *eternal* life are nearly as conspicuous in John¹ as is the Kingdom of God in the synoptists. In the synoptists Jesus speaks of men as sons of God,² and on a single occasion speaks of himself as son in a unique sense (Mt. 11:27); but in John men are never called sons of God but "children" (e.g., 1:12; 11:52), and Jesus speaks of himself as Son in a unique sense more than a score of times.³ In the synoptists Jesus does not publicly claim Messiahship until the day of his death (Mk. 14:62), and even then not on his own initiative; but in John he explicitly declares his Messiahship to the woman at the well (4:26) and to the man born blind (9:35-38), and on another occasion when the Jews demand a plain answer to the question whether he is the Christ, he replies that he has told them (10:24-25).

¹ See, e.g., 1:4; 3:15; 4:14; 5:24; 6:27; 8:12; 10:10, etc.

² See, e.g., Matt. 5:9, 45; Lk. 20:36.

³ See, e.g., 1:18, 34, 49; 3:16; 5:20; 6:62; 8:28, etc.

Another point of deep significance is that of Jesus in prayer. Here we refer especially to his own example. That Jesus was in the habit of praying is well attested in the synoptists,¹ but in John there is not only no instance of Jesus' retiring into solitude for prayer, but the religious term for praying (*προσεύχεσθαι*), which all the synoptists employ, is not found in his Gospel. Here Jesus "asks" or "requests" the Father (*αἰτεῖν*, *ἑρωτᾶν*), as one person asks another. How different this Johannine "asking" is from real prayer appears from two of the three instances when Jesus, in John's narrative, spoke to the Father. At the tomb of Lazarus, after the words, "Father, I thank thee that thou heardest me," he adds that he spoke thus "because of the multitude" (11:41-42), and on the occasion of the visit of certain Greeks, when he had said, "Father, glorify thy name," and when a voice had come out of heaven in response, he said of it, "This voice hath not come for *my sake*, but for *your sakes*" (12:27-30). Thus it would seem that, in the opinion of the writer, Jesus had no need of prayer in the synoptic sense, and hence of course no need of answers from the Father.

It may be noticed in this connection that the author of the fourth Gospel seems to neutralize the most conspicuous synoptic narrative of Jesus in prayer. Jesus prayed in the garden that a certain "cup"—presumably the cruel death that awaited him on the morrow—might pass from him (Mk. 14:36), but in John, when Jesus was considering his approaching fate, he asked in deep trouble of soul, "What shall I say?" (12:27-28). Then, recognizing that he had come "unto this hour" for "this cause," that is, that he might experience what it had in store for him, he said, "Father, glorify thy name." The situation is essentially the same that we have in the synoptists, but Jesus is represented as *refusing* to ask for deliverance from the "hour."²

Again, in the synoptists the universalism of Jesus is implicit, in John it is explicit. In the synoptic narrative

¹ E.g., Mk. 1:35; 6:46; 14:32.

² Even if we take the words: "Father, save me from this hour," as a prayer rather than as a part of his question, the very next words *recall* the prayer, and the contrast with the synoptic scene remains altogether striking.

he is represented as averse to answering the prayer of the Syro-Phoenician woman (Mk. 7:27), but in John the coming to him of certain foreigners brings exalted joy (12:20-23). From the conversation with Nicodemus forward the references of Jesus to his relation to mankind in its entirety are so numerous¹ as to constitute a conspicuous feature of the narrative.

Finally, in the synoptists Jesus says but little of the Spirit, and that little is not different from what is said in the prophets. The Spirit of God is God as present in human hearts and lives. In John, on the other hand, Jesus not only says much of the Spirit, but what he says is *not* essentially what was said by the prophets: it is something new. The Spirit is treated as personally distinct from God. In a sense, the Spirit is subordinate to Jesus (15:26; 14:26), which is the reverse of the relationship suggested in the synoptists (Lk. 12:10).

7. *Chronology.* It may be doubted whether the synoptists wished to indicate the length of the Master's public life, but if we infer *anything* from their narrative on this point it must be that it favors a ministry of about one year. They speak of only one Passover (Mk. 14:1). John, on the other hand, seems to give a chronological outline of the ministry of Jesus, and this outline includes three² Passovers, thus giving the ministry a duration of about two years.

John puts the cleansing of the temple at the beginning of Jesus' ministry (2:13-22), the synoptists put it in the last week of his life (Mk. 11:15-17). Peter's confession, according to the synoptists, was in the region of Caesarea Philippi (Mk. 8:27, 29), and was the confession of a faith hitherto unuttered; but in John Peter makes a confession in Capernaum, *before* the day at Caesarea Philippi, and this confession renders the synoptic one impossible (6:66-71). According to the synoptists Jesus was anointed in Bethany two days before the last Passover (Mk. 14:1-9), but in John there is an anointing in Bethany which must probably be identified with that of the

¹ See, e.g., 3:16-21; 5:22-23, 25, 28; 6:33; 8:12; 12:17; 17:21, 23.

² 2:13; 6:4; 12:1.

synoptists and it is *six* days before the Passover of the last week (12:1). Finally, the crucifixion occurred, according to the synoptists, on the 15th of the month Nisan (Mk. 14:12), the third hour (Mk. 15:25), but in John on the 14th,¹ at about the sixth hour (19:14).

The data which have now been presented, both those that show the agreement of John with the synoptists and those that show his departure from them, though they furnish good ground for a conclusion in regard to the historical character of John's Gospel, are not all the evidence that must be taken into account. The most important material of all, and that which has been too little considered, will be presented in the next section.

16. *The Greek Element in John.*

A Greek element is not only manifest in the introduction of John's Gospel but it is manifest as of *fundamental significance* for the entire course of the narrative about Jesus. The term *Logos* is indeed confined to the first fourteen verses, but the *conception* colors the author's thought of Jesus and of his work throughout. The statement that the *Logos* became flesh (1:14) (i.e., in Jesus) gives the reader the point of view from which everything in the subsequent chapters is to be regarded. That is the author's evident purpose. He did not regard the *Logos* and its relation to Jesus as a mere hypothesis, but as a great and unquestionable verity. Therefore he makes the incarnation of the *Logos* in Jesus the starting-point and foundation of his Gospel.

The author in his general description of the *Logos* betrays the *source* whence his conception was drawn. He affirms that the *Logos* had existed from the beginning and had existed in a relation of fellowship with God (1:1). He affirms that the *Logos* was *θεός*, not *ὁ θεός*. Thus while he identifies him with God he also discriminates, in some sense, between the two. Then he connects him with the universe and with history by the statements that he was the agent in universal creation, the source of life and light to mankind (1:3, 4); that he

¹ See 13:1, 29; 18:28.

came to his own, though not welcomed by them, and that in the author's own day he became flesh (1:11, 14).

This conception of the Logos is not Hebrew and it is not purely Greek. It is Greek as modified by the historical appearance of Jesus. It is not Hebrew: it has no living root in the Old Testament. The utmost that can be said is that certain Old Testament expressions—"word of God," "Spirit of God," and "wisdom"—are more or less parallel to it, and so made its introduction into Christian thought possible and easy.

The "word of God" in the Hebrew Scriptures is a symbol of his participation in human affairs.¹ Like his "breath" and his "hand" it brings him near, into actual contact with the world and with men. The conception of the Logos, on the other hand, removes God from such contact, for the Logos is an intermediary between God and his world. Again, the "Spirit of God" in the Old Testament is God in his most intimate approach to his spiritual creatures: it is not personally distinct from him. Functions are attributed to the Spirit (e.g., Gen. 1:2) which resemble those attributed to the Logos in John and in Greek philosophy, but nevertheless the two conceptions are by no means the same. From the Old Testament point of view, since the Spirit is not personally distinct from God, it is inconceivable that it should become flesh, as the Logos does in John. And again, the conception of the Spirit in the Old Testament serves to make the nearness of God felt, while the Logos doctrine in the Greek philosophers and Philo rather emphasizes the apartness, the transcendence, of God.

Finally, the conception of Wisdom which we find in Proverbs and in Sirach cannot be regarded as a living root of the Logos doctrine. For although wisdom is, in part, described in terms which remind us of the Logos (e.g., Prov. 8:30-31), it is nevertheless itself a *work* of God (Prov. 8:22), not his *agent* in creation.

It seems futile therefore to try to derive the doctrine of the Logos from the Old Testament. It is rather *opposed* to the Old Testament conception of God, for

¹ See, e.g., Ps. 33:6; 107:20, etc.

the Old Testament is monotheistic, but the doctrine of the Logos brings in a second Divine Being.

But when we turn from the Old Testament to Philo we come into a sphere of thought that is truly akin to that of John's Prologue. To Philo as to John the Logos is eternal.¹ In Philo as in John the Logos is called "God-like" (?) in distinction from God (*θεός*, not *ὁ θεός*).² In Philo as in John the Logos is the agent in universal creation.³ In Philo as in John the Logos stands in an intimate relation to man, for it is man's archetype even as God is its own archetype, and in general it is the mediator between God and man.⁴ Finally, in Philo as in John the Logos seems to be thought of, at times, as a personal being, as, for example, when it is called "high priest," "ambassador" between God and the cosmos, and "archangel of many names."⁵

This agreement between Philo and John is so broad and deep that we cannot reasonably deny a determinative influence of the earlier writer upon the later, though we need not suppose that this influence was exercised through books.

There are indeed differences between John's Logos conception and that of Philo, nor are these to be undervalued. Thus, the cloud of uncertainty resting on the personality of the Logos in Philo does not pertain to the Logos of John. Again, in John, but not clearly in Philo, the function of the Logos culminates in his *religious* service for men, for he brings them into the estate of children of God (1:11-12). Finally, the difference between Philo and John is seen in this, that John's doctrine has a supreme historical illustration.⁶ It is a creed of flesh and blood. In these respects John's conception is unlike Philo's, but the differences constitute a develop-

¹ See *Confus. ling.* 28; *Plant. Noe* 2 and 5.

² See *Leg. all.* 3:73; *Somn.* 1:29, 41.

³ See *Quod deus im.* 12; *Vita Mosis* 3:14; *Cherub.* 35; *Monarchia* 2:5; *De Cain. et Ab.* 3.

⁴ See *Mundi op.* 51; *Spec. leg.* 3:27, 4:4; *Plant Noe* 5; *De Prof.* 19.

⁵ See *Confus. ling.* 28; *Leg. all.* 3:25-26; *Cherub.* 5; *Somn.* 1:37, 40-41; *Quis rer. div. heres* 42; *Gigant.* 11; *Migrat. Abrah.* 18.

⁶ Scott, *The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology*, 1906, p. 155, holds that in Philo the Logos has more the force of *reason* and in John the force of *word*.

ment rather than an essential contrast. *They are such as followed necessarily from the identification of the Logos with the historical Jesus.*

Now since the Logos doctrine is essentially Greek, whatever we find in the Gospel of John that departs from the synoptic tradition and at the same time obviously stands in close relation to this doctrine as it is set forth in the prologue, must be regarded as a Greek modification of the primitive teaching. The following features of the Gospel present themselves here for consideration.

1. *John the Baptist.* According to the synoptists the Baptist announced that one was to come *after* him who was mightier than he; in John's Gospel the Baptist says that the one coming after him was *before* him, and does this in a manner to suggest something mysterious in the prior existence of Jesus (1:15, 30). This language is obviously explained by the statement in the Prologue that the Logos was "in the beginning." The author clearly modifies the synoptic representation to bring it into harmony with his new point of view. The doctrine that fills his own soul he imputes to the great forerunner of Jesus.

Again, when the Baptist, on recognizing Jesus as the one of whom he had witnessed to his disciples (1:29), puts him at once in relation to the *entire world* as the bearer of sin, we are constrained to see the influence of the Logos doctrine of the author. For, according to the synoptists, Jesus said of John that, though he was equal to any prophet, he was less than the least in the kingdom of God (Mt. 11:11). But how could Jesus have said that if John, far in advance of his own disciples, had recognized and declared the universal spiritual character of his ministry? This man was surely not the *least* in the kingdom of God, nor was he the same one who from the prison sent to Jesus to ask whether he was the "coming one." This is clearly the John of the Prologue (1:7, 15), and what he says is required by the Prologue's identification of the Logos with Jesus. For the Logos is there said to be the source of life and light for *mankind* (1:4), not simply for an elect people.

2. *The Knowledge of Christ.* (a) *Extent.* Since the Logos was thought of by the author as incarnate in Jesus, we expect Jesus to exhibit the same degree of knowledge that the Logos had possessed. The Logos as the eternal companion of God (1:1, *πρὸς τὸν θεόν*) and the agent in universal creation must have a knowledge immeasurably transcending that of man, and such, according to this Gospel, was indeed the knowledge of the historical Jesus. When first he met Simon, he gave his father's name, and foreseeing what Simon would become, gave to him the name Cephas (1:42). When Nathanael was brought to him, he not only read his character but announced that he had seen him beneath the fig-tree—an announcement which convinced Nathanael that he was the Son of God (1:45-51). He told the Samaritan woman that she had had five husbands (4:18), and when far away across the Jordan, in Perea, he was aware of what transpired in the home of Lazarus in Bethany (11:14). The author of the Gospel declares comprehensively, that Jesus knew what was in man (2:25). When Jesus asked Philip whence they were to secure bread for the multitude, he did it to prove him, for he himself knew what he would do (6:6). In like manner he knew from "the beginning" who they were who believed not, and who it was that should betray him (6:64). The apostles are represented as confessing: "Now know we that thou knowest *all* things" (16:30), and in the Appendix Peter makes the same confession (21:17).

Thus the Jesus who, according to the synoptists, declared that he did not know the day or the hour of his own coming in glory (Mk. 13:32), he who was deceived by the appearance of a certain fig-tree (Mk. 11:13), who asked questions for information as other men did,¹ and who in Gethsemane prayed that a certain cup might pass from him (Mk. 14:36)—a prayer which, like every other real prayer for a specific boon, implied ignorance of the Father's will—this Jesus is here, in John, clothed with seeming omniscience, but surely with a knowledge indefinitely surpassing that of man. To what is this trans-

¹ See, e.g., Mk. 8:5, 27; 9:16, 21.

formation to be attributed? We need not look beyond the Logos-doctrine of the author. What the Logos knew, Jesus knew, for Jesus was the incarnate Logos. This conclusion receives confirmation from the following paragraph.

(b) *Acquisition*. The knowledge of Jesus, according to John, was not only supernatural in extent, but it dated from a preëxistent state. Jesus said he could tell Nicodemus "heavenly things" because he himself had descended out of heaven (3:12-13). He knew God because he was *from* him (6:46; 7:29), and he declared his witness to be true because he knew whence he came and whither he went (8:14). He spoke those things which the Father had taught him or which he had heard from him (8:26, 28); he bore witness to what he had seen (3:11).

Now this thought which is attributed to Jesus in the Gospel of John—that his teaching was in words that he had heard with the Father, that his knowledge of God was conditioned on his having come forth from God—this same thought is also found in the author's own summary declaration at the beginning of his narrative, "the only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" (1:18), and it is implied in his fundamental proposition that the Logos became flesh in Jesus (1:14). The synoptists, however, make no allusion to this heavenly state and heavenly tuition. In them, the Old Testament is the background of Jesus' thought, and there is no suggestion that his knowledge of God had been acquired in any extraordinary way.

3. *The Nature of Jesus*. We find in John both the early conception of Jesus as a man clothed with the Messianic office and also a new transcendental element. He is the Son of Man, that is, the Messiah (e.g., 6:53), as in the synoptists, but he is the Son of Man who has come down from heaven (3:13), and who is to ascend where he was *before* (6:62). Again, he is the Christ, the King of Israel, the Son of God, even he that was to come,¹ which is no more than the synoptists also assert,²

¹ See 1:49; 11:27; 20:31.

² See, e.g., Mk. 14:61, 62; 1:11; 9:7.

but now the "coming" is no longer, as in the synoptists,¹ a simple equivalent for a man's appearance on the stage of history, but it is a coming *from another world* into this (e.g., 16:28). The "Son" is *uniquely* begotten of God,² and not in the same manner in which the "children" of God are begotten of him (1:13, 3:3). Therefore the union of the Son with the Father is more than *moral* harmony, though it is certainly this (17:11): it also rises into what we of the present call the sphere of *essential* being. Hence it is the Son, according to this Gospel, and *only* the Son, who glorifies the Father, and whom the Father will glorify with himself.³

There are other data in John that throw light on the transcendental element in the nature of Jesus. Thus the statement that the Son has life *in himself*, as has the Father (5:26), from which it follows that he can lay down his life and take it again (10:18), and that he can bestow life on whom he will (5:21; 6:44), implies, as does the term "only-begotten," a unique metaphysical relation to God. Again, it seems not improbable that the author thought of Jesus as able at will to become invisible, for twice, while still in the midst of his enemies, he is "hidden" from them (8:59; 12:36). Last of all, we must note in this connection the significant omissions of the Johanne narrative. The baptism, the temptation, the agony in the garden are all wanting here, as is also the entire element of supplication in Jesus' communion with the Father. It is obvious, with a little thought, that each of these omitted features presents difficulties to the adoption of the Logos doctrine. It is probable that for this very reason they were omitted.

This departure from the synoptic representation of Jesus is too obviously congruous with the Logos conception of the Prologue to need comment. It is not only congruous with that conception, but seems to be necessarily involved in it.

4. *Mediatorship of Jesus.* (a) *Its Nature.* Jesus appears in John as the sovereign representative of God.

¹ See Mt. 11:3, 14.

² See 13:31; 14:13; 16:14; 17:1, 5.

³ See 1:18, 3:16, 18.

The Father recedes into the background: he is not needed where Jesus is. It is peculiar to the Johannine mediatorship of Jesus that it separates God and the soul rather than unites them. By keeping the commandments of Christ the disciple abides in *his* love, as *he* abides in the love of the Father (15:10). It is not said that the *disciple* abides in the *Father's* love: that is the privilege of Jesus only. The disciple can only aspire to an abiding in him as he abides in the Father. The passage 17:21 is not a real exception, for it does not speak of an *independent* abiding of the believer in God, but it represents Jesus as saying "that they may be *in us*," that is to say, the believer is in the Father only by virtue of his relation to Jesus.

This conception of the mediatorship of Jesus is much unlike that of the synoptists. We may take the parable of the Lost Son as typical of Jesus' mediatorship according to the early Gospel (Lk. 15:11-32). That story is a revelation of God's character. Its power lies in its presentation of the Father's love. Jesus makes that so real and mighty that it draws the wanderer back to his Father's house. As Jesus trusted in the Father and found his own strength in that trust, so he sought to establish his disciples also on the same foundation. It is emphatically true of Jesus that he preached not himself but the Father. Far from claiming that men should honor him as they honored the Father (Jn. 5:23), he studiously avoided, until the very end of his ministry, even the claim to be the Messiah.

But while this conception of mediatorship is widely different from that of the synoptists, it is quite in harmony with the Logos-doctrine of the author. For according to this, God does not come into contact with the world or with men, but works through the Logos. Once identify the Logos in all his fulness with Jesus, as the Prologue of John does, and we cannot be surprised to hear Jesus say that men should honor him as they honor the Father, and that the goal of spiritual development is that the disciple should abide in *him* as *he* abides in the Father.

Thus the difference between the mediatorship of Jesus

according to John and that of the synoptists is just such as the Logos doctrine naturally introduces. And as that doctrine is Greek, so this modification of early teaching must be set down to Greek influence.

(b) *Its universality.* Hardly a feature of the Gospel of John is more striking, as one comes to it from the synoptists, than its universality. The Baptist and the woman of Samaria, as well as Jesus himself, speak of the Gospel in its relation to the *whole world*. The bread of God gives life to humanity in general, irrespective of all national lines (6:33). The light in Jesus is the light of the world (8:12; 9:5). What he speaks, he speaks to the world (8:26), and his promise is that he will draw *all* men unto himself (12:32).

This universalism of John is in marked contrast to the synoptic representation. There Jesus told his disciples that he was sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Mt. 15:24), and to them he sent his disciples (10:6). His habitual outlook was national, though references to a world-wide influence are not wholly wanting (e.g., Mt. 5:14; 14:9). Jesus would have been less optimistic than the Old Testament had he not anticipated that his kingdom would eventually bless all nations. But at the same time, his eye was habitually upon his own people Israel, and allusions to a universal work are exceptional. He was a Jew and spoke with Jews in mind. But in John the national character of the work of Jesus is lost in its universal character. He does not talk as a prophet of Israel, but as the Light of the world.

But while in strongest contrast to the synoptic teaching this feature of John is a natural corollary of the Logos-doctrine. Since the Logos, before his incarnation, was the light of all men (1:4), it was to be expected that, when incarnate, his mission would be universal. The pre-incarnate Logos had indeed sustained a peculiar relation to the Jewish people (1:11), and so, according to John, did the incarnate Logos, inasmuch as his earthly manifestation was almost wholly limited to them; but this limitation was only temporary. His essential relationships are thought of as universal.

5. *The Fatherhood of God.* In the Gospel of John God's fatherhood is practically limited to Jesus. The familiar synoptic words "your Father" occur but once in John (20:17), and even then they are limited to the disciples of Jesus. God is occasionally spoken of as "the Father" in an absolute sense,¹ but with the single exception noted above his fatherhood is not brought into *personal* relation to any one besides Jesus. This fact is the more noticeable because John uses the name "Father" almost as many times as all the synoptists together. Jesus says "my Father" many times, and many times says "the Father" when the connection limits the fatherly relation to himself, but the free and gracious use of the term which characterizes the synoptic story is absent here.

In harmony with this limitation of fatherhood is the fact that, in John, with the single exception of 3:16, the love of God is confined to Jesus and to those who love Jesus. The thought is emphatically expressed that the way to secure the Father's love is to love Jesus (e.g., 14:21; 16:27).

Now this limitation of God's fatherhood, which stands in such striking opposition to the synoptic teaching, is easily intelligible from the standpoint of the Prologue. A Jesus who was the incarnation of the eternal Logos, that being who had always stood in intimate fellowship with God and through whom God's power and grace had been revealed, might naturally claim an altogether unique place in God's love, and his sonship might naturally be set forth as the fact supremely worthy of consideration.

This survey of the Greek element in the Gospel of John, though it may have omitted details that ought to appear and may include others which might be otherwise explained, seems to me to be the cap-stone of the evidence that in this remarkable writing we have, not history and not biography, but a profound philosophical meditation in which the facts of the life of Jesus are treated with sovereign freedom. It is not necessary to believe that every fact has been so treated—that there are *no* trustworthy data in the document. Much indeed can be said

¹ See 4:2; 6:27, 46, etc.

for the historical value of certain features of the Johanne representation,¹ and a wise criticism will ever seek to discover and use all such reliable material; but the author himself unmistakably puts us on our guard against accepting *any* statement in his writing as historical except on thorough investigation, and in this investigation the earliest documents embedded in the synoptic Gospels will always have a determinative influence. And, in any case, whether one sees in the Gospel of John a relatively small historical element or a relatively large one, its value for the reconstruction of the life of Jesus is less than its value for the history of early Christian belief. Much that the author carries back to the teaching of Jesus is probably the utterance of his own spiritual experience and that of his contemporaries. Without going the length of regarding the book as "the supremely true interpretation of Jesus Christ," it can hardly be denied that some of its affirmations are confirmed by common Christian experience.

A word, finally, as to the author and date of composition of this writing.

The pervasive *Greek* element in the Gospel of John—not to mention other significant considerations—seems to render the traditional view that it was composed by John the son of Zebedee, whom Acts calls a "pillar" of the church at Jerusalem, impossible. Whether the Gospel made use of a Johannine tradition, written or oral, is an open question. Recent discussion of the date of composition of this work is strongly in favor of the early part of the second century. The suggestion that the author sustained a double relation to Gnosticism, showing now a sympathy with its teaching (note his emphasis on *knowledge*, 5:42; 7:17; 8:32; 17:2) and again turning away from it (note his insistence on the reality of Christ's humanity, 4:6; 11:35; 19:34), seems a better reason for assigning the book to the period 100-120 A.D. than the language of 5:43 is for assigning it to a time subsequent to Barcochba's uprising (132 A.D.).

¹ See the discussion of *The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel* by Alan England Brooke in the volume of *Cambridge Essays*, ed. by H. B. Swete, 1909, pp. 291-328.

CHAPTER III

OTHER SOURCES FOR THE LIFE OF JESUS

18. *The Lack of early Jewish or Pagan References to Jesus.*

All early and first-hand knowledge of Jesus comes from Christian sources. In the century after his death one Jewish writer and three Romans allude to him or to the new religion that bore his name, but their allusions are of the most meagre sort. Josephus (37 to about 100 A.D.) refers to Jesus in a wholly incidental manner when describing the death of James. This man, he says, was the brother of Jesus who was called Christ¹—that is all. He says much more about John the Baptist, more about Judas of Galilee who made an insurrection in 6 A.D. Whether he ignored Jesus from a personal anti-Christian motive or out of regard for his Roman readers does not appear.

Pliny the younger (62-113 A.D.), who had made a campaign in Syria in the generation following Paul's work there and who was consul of Pontus and Bithynia in 103 A.D., in a letter to Trajan regarding the persecution of Christians, says that they sang hymns to Christ, from which it appears that he regarded Christ as the founder of the Christian sect, but he manifests not the slightest personal interest in him. The new sect was in his judgment a "debased and immoderate superstition" which he believed could be suppressed. Suetonius, a historian of the Caesars who wrote after the close of the apostolic age, has merely a vague echo of the name of Christ² in a passage regarding the expulsion of the Jews from Rome. Finally, Tacitus himself (about 51-113

¹ *Antiq.* 20.9.1. The passage 18.3.3 is universally recognized as corrupt.

² *Claudius*, 25.

A.D.), though he had so far investigated the history of the Jews that he was able to give a half-dozen theories of their origin,¹ and though he thought it worthy of his pages to mention the prodigies said to have been seen in Jerusalem before its fall,² refers to Christ only as an item of subordinate interest in his description of the burning of Rome. He says that the man from whom the Christians were called—"this most mischievous superstition"—suffered the extreme penalty during the reign of Tiberius at the hands of Pontius Pilate. Evidently the celebrated Roman historian saw nothing in Christ and the Christian movement of his time that was significant for the empire or for himself. As far as that movement had any meaning at all, it was evil and evil only.

Other eminent writers of the early Christian decades, as Philo of Alexandria (a contemporary of Jesus and Paul), Seneca (†65 A.D.) and Plutarch (†ca. 120 A.D.), do not even allude to Jesus. This is particularly noteworthy in the case of Plutarch, for he had both a wide knowledge of men and events and also an intense interest in whatever concerned morals and religion. He wrote biographies of men who were nearly or quite contemporary with Jesus, but of this man, whose influence now immeasurably outweighs that of all the heroes of his fascinating pages, he appears not even to have heard. With facts like these in view we are reminded of the words of Jesus that the kingdom of heaven is like leaven, and that it cometh not with observation. Paul indeed said to the Romans "your faith is proclaimed throughout the *whole world*" (1:8), and to the Thessalonians "from you hath sounded forth the word of the Lord, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but in *every place* your faith to God-ward is gone forth" (1 Th. 1:8), but this is the language of ardent enthusiasm. Until long after Paul had finished his "good fight" the great Greek and Roman world as represented by its distinguished writers was apparently quite unacquainted with Jesus and knew of his followers only to despise them as an offshoot of the

¹ *History*, 5:2.

² *History*, 5:13.

Jewish religion, which was generally regarded as "tasteless and mean."

When therefore we speak of the sources of our historical knowledge of Jesus we must recognize that they are distinctly Christian and almost exclusively limited to the New Testament.

19. *The Epistles of the New Testament and the Life of Jesus.*

Of New Testament epistles there is a group of at least six¹ which are conceded to have been written some years before the earliest of our Gospels. When we examine these writings in relation to the life and teaching of Jesus, we notice, first, that they give a number of concrete facts regarding his life but make scarcely any *direct* reference to his teaching; and second that they show no trace of written sources of information on these subjects. Paul gives a considerable number of details about the earthly career of Jesus. He speaks of him as sprung from the seed of David, as a man who had several brothers, of whom one was called James.² He was meek and gentle in manner and lived a sinless life.³ He gathered a company of disciples which at the time of his death numbered more than five hundred, and he appointed twelve apostles.⁴ His distinctive teaching, which Paul calls a "law," was concerned with man's relation to his fellowmen.⁵ He instituted a supper for his disciples in the night of his betrayal; he was crucified and buried; on the third day he was raised.⁶ Afterward he appeared to Peter, to James, twice to the Twelve, and once to more than five hundred brethren.⁷

Now while these details, with the exception of the second and third, are important, they are quite disconnected, and no one of the passages gives us a warm and vivid glimpse of the Master's life.

¹ The four major epistles of Paul—Romans, Corinthians (1-11) and Galatians. This group might be enlarged to ten with very wide consent of scholars.

² Rom. 1:3; I Cor. 9:5; Gal. 1:19.

³ II Cor. 10:1; 5:21.

⁴ I Cor. 15:6; 15:5.

⁶ I Cor. 11:23; Gal. 2:20; I Cor. 15:4.

⁵ Gal. 6:2.

⁷ I Cor. 15:5-7.

Again, these letters make little *direct* account of the teaching of Jesus. By bearing one another's burdens the Galatians are told that they fulfil the "law" of Christ (6:2), and one may assume that in his preaching to the Galatians Paul had illustrated this "law of Christ" by quotations from the Master's teaching, but this is of course not certain. In his first letter to the Corinthians he alludes to the teaching of Jesus on the subject of divorce (7:10-12), and later cites the words which Jesus is said to have used at the Supper (11:24-26). This lack of appeal to the spoken words of Jesus seems to have been according to a settled principle of the apostle, for he declares that the gospel preached by him came "through revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. 1:12). Among the Corinthians at least he was determined not to know anything save Jesus Christ and him crucified (1 Cor. 2:2),—a word which certainly suggests a relatively slight interest in the teaching of Jesus which had been handed down by tradition and also in the events of his career with the exception of the crucifixion. Possibly this tradition was in mind when the apostle declared that he no longer knew Christ "after the flesh" (2 Cor. 5:16).

The second point noted above was that these early Christian letters make no reference to any writing on the life or the teaching of Jesus. Converts were not referred to any Christian writings for instruction, but were referred to the Hebrew Scriptures. Paul, even when speaking on the resurrection—a subject that he argued at length—made no appeal to Christian documents in confirmation of the alleged event. It may well be that this would in any case have seemed to him unnecessary in view of the fact that there were living witnesses (1 Cor. 15:6).

Not only does Paul make no allusion to a written source of information on the life and words of Jesus, but the details which he gives imply a source somewhat different from our synoptic Gospels. Thus these Gospels know nothing of an appearance of the risen Jesus to above five hundred brethren at once, nor do the words of Jesus at the giving of the bread and wine which Paul

records in I Cor. 11:24-25 agree wholly with those in either of the synoptists.

Such then, in few words, is the relation of the earliest New Testament letters to the life and teaching of Jesus. What has been said of the early Church¹ is eminently true of Paul, that his thought was "fixed on the heavenly Christ, in whose career the earthly appearance of Jesus was a mere transitory, though an important, episode." Doubtless the speedy coming of Christ which was universally anticipated in the first Christian decades tended powerfully to turn the mind of the Church away from the past to the all-absorbing future.

20. *Fragments of Lost Gospels.*

(1) *The Gospel according to the Hebrews.*² Jerome and Origen, to whom we are indebted for most of the fragments of this ancient writing, most commonly designated it as the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. There was a copy of it in the library at Caesarea in the time of Jerome. The Gospel was written, Jerome tells us, in Hebrew characters but in the Chaldee tongue. He translated it both into Greek and Latin.³ It was used in his time by the sects of the Nazarenes and Ebionites,⁴ and it is plain from the manner in which Origen refers to it that it was not accepted by all Christians in his time.

The esteem in which this Gospel was held by such men as Origen and Jerome, who had the complete Gospel in their hands, is a fact that commends it to us, as also is Jerome's statement—which we are not able to test—that the Gospel of the Hebrews cited the Old Testament according to the original and not from the Septuagint.⁵ A further presumption in its favor is established if we accept Harnack's⁶ conclusion that its composition must be assigned to the period 65 (70)-100 A.D., which makes it a contemporary of the synoptic Gospels.

It is necessary therefore to consider the extant frag-

¹ Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*.

² Jerome refers to it as *evangelium secundum Hebraeos*, *Evang. juxta Hebraeos*, and *hebraicum* (evang.); Clement of Alexandria and Origen call it τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίων εὐαγγέλιον; Origen also calls it simply τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν.

³ *De vir. ill.* c. 2.

⁵ *De vir. ill.* c. 3.

⁴ *Contra Pel.* 3, 2; *Com. on Matt.* 12:13.

⁶ *Geschichte der Altchristl. Literatur*, 2:1, p. 650.

ments of this Gospel somewhat in detail in order that we may determine whether they are to be regarded as trustworthy sources of information on the life of Jesus.

With the exception of two or three minor textual points, the fragments are as follows:¹

(1) "Behold, the mother of the Lord and his brothers said to him, John the Baptist is baptizing for the remission of sins: let us go and be baptized of him. But he said to them, In what have I sinned that I should go and be baptized of him, unless perchance this very word that I have spoken be ignorance."

(2) "Moreover it came to pass, when the Lord came up out of the water, that all the fountain of the Holy Spirit descended and rested upon him, and said to him: My Son, in all the prophets I waited for thee to come, that I might rest in thee; for thou art my rest, thou art my first-born Son, who reigneth for ever."

(3) "Now my mother the Holy Spirit took me by one of the hairs of my head, and bore me away to the great mountain Tabor."

(4) In the Lord's Prayer the Gospel according to Hebrews had, instead of "daily," the word "morrow."

(5) "I was a stone-mason, earning my food with my hands. I pray thee, Jesus, to restore me to health that I may not beg bread in shame."

(6) "If thy brother have sinned in word and have confessed to thee, receive him seven times in the day. Simon, his disciple, said to him, Seven times in the day? The Lord replied and said to him, Yea, I say to thee, until seventy times seven. For even in the prophets, after they had been anointed with the Holy Spirit, sinful speech was found."

(7) "Another of the rich men said to him, Master, what good thing shall I do that I may live? He said to him, Man, do the laws and the prophets. He replied, I have done (them). He said to him, Go, sell all thou hast, and divide it among the poor, and come, follow me. But the rich man began to scratch his head and he was not pleased. And the Lord said to him, How sayest thou, I

¹ From Nestle's *N. T. Graeci Supplementum*, 1896, pp. 76-81.

have done the law and the prophets? For it is written in the law, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; and lo, many brothers of thine, sons of Abraham, are clothed in filth, dying of hunger, and thy house is full of good things, and nothing at all goes forth from it to them. And having turned he said to Simon his disciple who was sitting near him, Simon, son of John, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven."

(8) In the Gospel of the Hebrews it was said that "the lintel of the temple, which was of great size, collapsed," i.e. at the death of Jesus.

(9) "But the Lord, when he had given the linen cloth to the servant of the priest, went to James and appeared to him. For James had vowed that he would not eat bread from that hour when he had drunk the cup of the Lord until he should see him risen from those who sleep." . . . "The Lord said, Bring a table and bread." . . . "He took bread and blessed and brake and gave to James the Just and said to him, My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of Man is risen from those who sleep."

(10) "And never rejoice, said he, unless ye see your brother in love."

(11) "He who wonders shall rule and he who rules shall find rest."

Of these fragments only one is purely narrative, that concerning the lintel of the temple. This feature looks like a modification of Amos 9:1. In itself it is vague, for there was more than one door in the temple, and so more than one lintel.

In the remaining fragments we have words of Jesus, or—in one instance—simply words *to* Jesus. These we must look at in the light of the *Logia* and of the triple tradition.

The summons to Jesus from his mother and brothers to go to the baptism of John is certainly not intrinsically probable. It is more likely that Jesus was the first of the household to start for the Jordan than that his mother and brothers were first.

But the evident point of this story is the answer of

Jesus. He is represented as conceding the possibility that he had been guilty of a sin of ignorance in uttering words which implied sinlessness. It has been said that no one in the early Church would have imputed these words to Jesus, for he was everywhere regarded as sinless, and that they must therefore have been spoken by him.¹ But surely the Jesus who comes before us in the *Logia* and in the synoptic narrative *knew himself*. His mind was not in a hazy state. He is not the kind of man to say that "perhaps" he has spoken in ignorance. It is easier to suppose that these words are quite fictitious than to reconcile them with what our best sources teach about Jesus.

In the account of the baptism of Jesus the Gospel of the Hebrews departs widely both from the Old Testament and from the synoptic Gospels. It represents the Messiah as the Son of the *Spirit*, not as the Son of the Father (Ps. 2:7; 2 Sam. 7:14), and as addressed at his baptism not by the Father (Mk. 1:11), but by the Spirit. This language is in line with the account of the miraculous birth of Jesus, and may have come from the same circle. Further, the Spirit's identification of itself with the prophets and its longing for the Messiah's coming that it might find rest in him are features of secondary character. For whatever conversation the Spirit had with Jesus at his baptism must have been reported to the disciples by him; but we know from the *Logia* that his conception of the Spirit was that of the Old Testament prophets—a conception fundamentally different from this.

The other passage in which the Spirit is involved makes an equally strong impression of being secondary in character. The words "My mother the Holy Spirit took me by one of the hairs of my head and bore me away to the great mountain Tabor" are obviously a reminiscence of Ezekiel 8:8. The conception of the Spirit is as far removed as possible from that in the synoptic narrative. According to that, Jesus went forth into the wilderness under the stress of an inner impulse; but here he is

¹ Harnack, *Gesch. d. alt. Literatur*, 2:1, p. 648; Holtzmann, *The Life of Jesus*, Engl. ed. p. 47.

taken to Tabor by a purely external agency of the Spirit.

As to the peculiar reading of the Lord's Prayer in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, we surely ought not to argue that it must be original because it is Aramaic. Who can guarantee that the Jewish Christian disciples of Palestine were blameless preservers of tradition? The mere fact that they spoke the language of Jesus is surely not a proof that they comprehended his teaching. The reading *machar* (מחר), which Jerome renders *crastinum*, is assuredly difficult, but that fact alone cannot secure its acceptance as original. It is *too* difficult, for it introduces a thought which is directly at variance with the context. Jesus was seeking to inculcate trust in the heavenly Father. He told his disciples that they were not to be anxious for the morrow. Are we then to hold that he taught them to pray, "Give us today *tomorrow's* bread"? Before we substitute this for the reading of the *Logia*, we ought at least to see the entire verse as it stood in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*.

The next passage in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, parallel to Mark 3:1-6, makes a favorable impression, and so also does the clause which it adds to the words of Jesus regarding the forgiveness of a penitent brother: "For even in the prophets, after they had been anointed with the Holy Spirit, sinful speech was found."

We come now to the story of the rich young man who came to Jesus with the question what good thing he should do in order that he might live. The course of thought in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* is not so clear as it is in the synoptists. When the man says that he has kept the law and the prophets, Jesus does not challenge the claim: he calls upon him to dispose of his property and become his disciple. But afterward, when the man is displeased at Jesus' word, the Lord is represented as going back to the former response and as showing up the man's insincerity. But it is inherently improbable that Jesus, knowing that the man was insincere, would have summoned him to discipleship.

Thus while the story appears to be independent of the synoptists, it is also inferior to them.

The remaining fragment, if we except the two brief ethical maxims which are without special weight for the question of the historical value of the document, is concerned with the resurrection of Jesus, and reveals the utterly secondary character of this Nazarene Gospel. The gift of the linen cloth to the "servant of the priest" involves a departure from all New Testament representations of the resurrection, for it implies an appearance of the risen Lord to a person who was *not* a disciple. Again, the assumption that one of the brothers of Jesus could have made a vow not to eat until he should see Jesus risen from those who sleep is utterly improbable. That would clearly imply a sure belief that Jesus would soon rise, but this is contrary to all that we know even of the *disciples'* attitude toward the resurrection of Jesus, not to speak of the attitude of those who were not disciples.

We conclude therefore from this examination of the fragments of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* that this writing, even though of high antiquity, was not worthy to be classed with the synoptic Gospels as a source of information on the life and teaching of Jesus. The fragments are of interest and in various ways throw light on our Gospels, but they are of no independent historical value.

(2) *The Gospel of Peter*. A Gospel with this name was in use at the close of the second century at Rhossus, and Serapion, bishop of Antioch (190-203 A.D.), to whose see Rhossus belonged, judged concerning it that while most of it belonged to the right teaching of the Saviour, some things were added. Eusebius put it among the writings which had been produced by heretics and falsely ascribed to apostles.¹

A fragment of this Gospel, equal to about two average chapters of Mark, was discovered in 1886 at Akhmim, Egypt, and was published in 1892. From this it is evident that the author was unacquainted with the political condition of Palestine in the time of Christ, for it represents *Herod* as giving command that Jesus should be crucified, while Pilate holds a subordinate position.

¹ *Church Hist.* 3.25.6.

The *legendary* strain in this fragment is conspicuous. Thus it says that when the body of Jesus, having been lowered from the cross, touched the ground, the "whole earth quaked;" and again, when the two heavenly ones who had entered the sepulchre come forth, supporting Jesus between them, a cross follows them, and this cross utters an intelligible "yea" in response to the question from the sky, "Hast thou preached to them that slept?" To the same strain belongs the statement that the heads of the two who supported Jesus reached unto the heavens, but "the head of him that was led by them overpassed the heavens." This element goes much beyond anything in the synoptic Gospels.

The *dogmatic bias* of the Gospel of Peter, to judge from our fragment, agrees with what Eusebius reports Serapion as having said of it, namely, that it came from the *Docetists*. These men distinguished between Jesus and Christ, and taught that Christ departed from Jesus before his death. The most notable utterance of the fragment is its version of the cry of Jesus on the cross, which reads, "My Power, my Power, thou hast forsaken me." This is nearer to the peculiar view of the Docetists than it is to the thought of Ps. 22:1, which is quoted in the canonical Gospels.

The crude workmanship of the story is variously manifest. Thus the representation that it became light just after the body was taken down from the cross and that it was then found to be the ninth hour is intrinsically improbable, for it shortens the time that Jesus was on the cross—a period so short even in the synoptists that Pilate "marvelled" (Mk. 15:44). It is also improbable that, after the sun had come out again, "the Jews and the elders and the priests, perceiving what evil they had done to themselves, began to lament and to say, "Woe for our sins: the judgment hath drawn nigh and the end of Jerusalem." So to speak is to attribute to Jews the Christian sense of the importance of the death of Jesus.

We conclude that this fragment of the *Gospel of Peter*, though it may have originated in the early part of the

second century,¹ has no claim to be ranked with the synoptists as a source of information on the life of Jesus. Its chief historical interest lies in the fact that it corroborates the Marcan view of the appearance of the risen Lord (Mk. 14:28; 16:7) and also the Johannine implication that the ascension was on the day of the resurrection (Jn. 20:17).

¹ Harnack, *Geschichte d. alt. Literatur*, 2:1, p. 622.

PART II

THE HISTORICAL JESUS

CHAPTER I

THE WORLD IN WHICH JESUS LIVED

EVERY man who lives among men, however unique his native endowments and however absorbing his contemplation of God, is in a real and important sense a son of his people and his age. His roots go down deep into forgotten generations, while the attitude and the utterance of his spirit, deeply determined by his nearer environment, are not wholly unaffected by those wider circles and movements of thought and action that lie far out beyond the horizon.

Among the great and abiding achievements of modern biblical science, perhaps the first of all in its far-reaching and profound significance, is the fact that through its agency the Bible, so long isolated and treated as a thing by itself, having affiliations heavenward only, has come to be set in the midst of the world's sacred books as a near blood-relative, a member even of the same family, though having in its heart a purer hope and having an eye that is kindled by a clearer and completer vision of what the human spirit longs to know.

From the sweep of this tendency to understand the biblical religion as a part of the multiform religious life of mankind it is impossible, even were it desired, to preserve, untouched, the life and teaching of him in whom the Semitic religious spirit found its final and perfect expression.

A survey of the world, therefore, as it was in the days of Jesus is needful to one who would see in true perspective this character which, by a truer interpretation and more intelligent acceptance on the part of men, is destined to an ever higher place among the spiritual forces of history.

We go back in imagination to the year 749 of the Roman Era, which we will assume to have been the year of Jesus' birth, and we shall seek through the interrogation of men then living, and by observance of what was transpiring, to get a somewhat intimate yet comprehensive view of the world into which he was born, and thereafter shall follow swiftly the general course of Roman and Palestinian history through the brief span of that life which terminated in a public execution about the year 29 A.D.

In that year of 749 we find the world, that is, the Roman Empire, which stretched from the borders of India to the Pillars of Hercules and from the North Sea to the First Cataract of the Nile,¹ dominated by one great personality, Octavius Caesar, who was then at the height of his power. Twelve years before this, beginning at midnight of the last day of May, he had solemnly opened the New Age with religious services continued through three days and nights.² It was the common belief, greatly strengthened by the comet of the preceding winter, that the Golden Age had at last begun. Still earlier by fourteen years, at the battle of Actium (31 B.C.), Octavius, by the overthrow of Antony after twice seven years of bloody civil strife, had established his claim to be the heir of Julius Caesar.

From the time when he returned to Italy (29 B.C.) until the birth of Jesus, a period of about twenty-four years, the march of events had steadily heightened the glory of his name. The plain statement which he left to be inscribed on the iron pillars at the door of his mausoleum on the bank of the Tiber shows us vividly what manner of man he was in whose Egyptian title³ he is styled "Prince of Princes," "Son of the Sun," and "The Ever Living One." We read in this inscription,⁴ preserved in a remote temple of Asia Minor, that Augustus

¹ Pliny, *Natural History*, 2, 112, quotes Artemidorus as authority for the statement that the distance from India to the Pillars of Hercules is 8568 miles and that the greatest width of the Empire was 4490.

² See Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit*, 1896, I. 2, p. 1004.

³ See Wendland, *Die Hellenisch-Römische Kultur*, 1907, p. 102.

⁴ We quote this inscription according to the edition of the University of Pennsylvania, 1899.

741
13

had undertaken wars throughout the whole world and had extended the bounds of all the Roman provinces which were bordered by nations not yet subject to his sway; that because of his successes the Senate had decreed thanksgivings to the immortal gods fifty-five times, involving a total of 890 days given up to celebrations; that the temple of Janus, which in the seven centuries before his time had been closed but twice, he had closed three times; that he had constructed fourteen temples in Rome at his own expense, and had restored eighty-two, not passing by any that was in need; that in his seventh consulship he received by decree of the Senate the title *Augustus*;¹ that in his eleventh consulship he made donations of food to the Roman populace twelve times and of money three times, never to less than 250,000 men at a time, and that in his twelfth consulship he gave twelve dollars apiece to 320,000 people; that he had settled the veterans of his legions on farms in Italy which cost him about thirty millions of dollars; and that the Senate had decreed him the name "Father of the Fatherland," to be inscribed in the vestibule of his house, also in the Curia and the Forum. We read further in this most illuminating inscription that Caesar's name had long stood in the sacred Salian Hymn, thus associating him with the gods of Rome, and that on his return from Gaul in the summer of 741, that is, about eight years before Jesus was born, an altar of Augustan Peace was decreed on which annual sacrifices were to be offered.

To these autobiographical statements which help us to picture the man through his deeds a significant word may be added from Plutarch.² According to this writer when the lament of Alexander the Great over the fact that there were no more kingdoms for him to conquer was mentioned in the presence of Augustus, the Emperor wondered that Alexander should not have thought it a smaller work to gain a great empire than to *set in order* what he had.

Thus, unconsciously perhaps, Augustus described his

¹ On the significance of this title see Firth, *Augustus Caesar*, 1903, p. 170.

² See *Miscellanies*, Goodwin's ed., 1.249.

own dominant purpose. It was to set the Roman world in order. It is true, he added vast areas to the imperial domain, and the statement of Eutropius¹ was a venial exaggeration, if any exaggeration at all, that no one was ever more fortunate in war than Augustus; yet it was the blessings and sweetness of public peace, the protection of law and the sense of security, which seemed to his contemporaries the greatest and most characteristic gift of his genius.²

In the work of setting the Roman Empire in order Augustus himself, apart from all his administrative measures, was the chief factor. The ends of the Empire were at one in their worship of *him*. In Egypt where the highest divine title had been given to rulers for nearly two centuries, in Egypt whose beautiful capital Augustus had graciously spared on entering it as conqueror, it was easy and natural that he should at once be counted with the elder gods. Nor does it seem to have been any the less natural in the Greek islands and along the shore of Asia Minor, the home of philosophy and art. The Halicarnassus inscription calls Augustus "Zeus of the Fatherland" and "Saviour of the common race of man," and in a decree of Assos he is called "god."³ Suetonius says that temples and altars to Augustus were erected in all the provinces.⁴ On the Monument of Ancyra,⁵ Augustus, looking back over his life, says: "The whole body of citizens have constantly sacrificed at every shrine for my good health." This is of course not formal divine worship, such as during his life was paid to him in the provinces, but it illustrates the point in hand, that Augustus himself was the great unifying force throughout the Empire. The poets of his day used language stronger than that of Augustus to which reference has just been made. Let the following lines of Horace represent both him and the younger poet Ovid. These writers shrank not from applying to their fellow Roman the

¹ See *Breviarium Hist. Romanae*, ed. Nisard, 1883, 7, 8. For a catalogue of the misfortunes of Augustus see Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, 7, 46.

² See Tacitus, *Annals*, 1, 9.

³ Wendland, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

⁴ *Lives of the Caesars: Augustus*, 49.

⁵ See chapt. 9 of *Mon. Ancyra*.

supreme divine title, as was done in the provinces. In an ode to Augustus Horace says :

"Each, passing his own day at his own doors,
Trains vines athwart his trees ; the joyous cup
Then handles as he wills, and *thee adores*
As God, in winding up.

As Hercules in Greece, or Castor, may,
So thou hast our libations and our prayers ;
Before our Lares we, our debt to pay,
Thy Godhead blend with theirs."¹

This cult of Augustus which, especially among Roman citizens, we may regard as "a sincere expression of loyalty to a political principle," while in the provinces it may have been rather the expression of a servile and idolatrous flattery, rested on great and substantial facts. Augustus by his pacific and lawful rule stood forth in a real sense as the "Saviour of the common race of men."² He did not come up to the ideal Wise Man of the Stoics, neither did any philosopher of that sect, though free from the dazzling temptations and the tremendous responsibilities which were inseparable from the high position of Augustus. Yet we may freely concede the truth of his modest words that he had committed to posterity *many examples worthy of imitation*.³

He lived in great plainness of dress and food, though master of endless resources. He preferred to wear garments that had been woven and made in his own dwelling by members of his own family.⁴ The old Roman domestic virtues were dear to him,⁵ and he sought to restore them in the society of his day. He preached the duty of marriage even though knights should be obliged to take wives from among emancipated slaves, and by the Julian Laws he sought to guard the sacredness of the marriage bond.⁶ He revived the worship of the Lares, the gods of the

¹ *Odes*, iv, 5, 15, Gladstone's version.

² Philo called him "the first and greatest and universal benefactor." *Ambassadors*, 22.

³ See *Mon. Ancyr.*, 8.

⁴ See Suetonius, *Augustus*, 73.

⁵ If we may trust Suetonius, the emperor's practice in this matter was not quite consistent with his principles.

⁶ See Gardthausen, *op. cit.*, p. 902.

hearth-stone and the common life.¹ He recognized the evil of making donations to the Roman populace, but he was not able to abolish the custom, though he did much for the revival of agriculture in Italy and thus lessened the number of the poor in Rome. When soldiers were discharged at the end of their long term of service, he settled them on farms and in this way not only kept them from swelling the dangerous pauper class in the capital, but secured to them a comfortable living. He founded the largest public library in Rome,² and we may infer that he was not indifferent in respect to the character of the books placed in it, for he gathered together all the so-called prophetic books which could be discovered, and caused them to be burned, excepting only the Sibylline writings. Suetonius tells us that about 2,000 books were thus destroyed.³

When Jesus was born, there was in the Hall of Agrippa in Rome a new and more accurate chart of the world, inscribed on marble and containing from 12,000 to 16,000 geographical names, and this work was completed by Augustus.⁴ When Jesus was born, the coinage of gold was uniform throughout practically the entire Roman Empire,⁵ and this too was due to Augustus. When Jesus was born, pirates had been swept from the seas,⁶ milestones had been set up along all the great military roads across the Empire and itineraries made which were based on a uniform unit of distance,⁷ and traffic and travel, far and near, had enormously increased. To this result Augustus was the chief contributor.

Thus the great and varied services of Augustus furnished a real basis for his cult and were together with that cult a means of unifying his wide and diversified realm.

But there was another great unifying force in active operation when Jesus was born, which is imperfectly

¹ See Horace, Ode quoted; Suetonius, *Augustus*, 31.

² The first public library in Rome is ascribed to A. Pollio. Plutarch ascribes another to Octavia.

³ See his *Augustus*, 31.

⁴ See Gardthausen, op. cit., p. 939.

⁵ See Gardthausen, op. cit., p. 554.

⁶ See *Mon. Ancyr.*, 25; Philo, *Ambassadors*, 21.

⁷ See Schiller, *Gesch. d. röm. Kaiserzeit*, 1883, I, 419.

represented to us by the terms *Greek thought* and *Greek speech*. When Augustus worshipped at the tomb of Alexander in Egypt, dedicating to him a coronet and flowers, he may not himself have fully realized the propriety of the act. By breaking down the barriers between Greek and barbarian, and by extending southward and eastward the benefits of Greek civilization, Alexander had done much to unify the various races in preparation for Augustus. Nor was this unifying influence confined wholly to the East. It had been at work also in Rome and Italy for generations. Greek speech and literature, Greek philosophers, Greek games, Greek merchants and physicians, tutors and artists, playwrights and astrol-ogers, had long been found in the maritime cities of Italy and in Rome.¹ They were there at the time of which we speak, unconsciously working with Augustus for the unification of the world. Where the Greek tongue was studied, Greek philosophy might go, and where Greek philosophy in its more practical ethical form went, there to some extent the way was prepared for the Gospel. As Clement of Alexandria said, Greek philosophy was a schoolmaster to lead the Gentiles to Christ, as the Law was for the Jews.²

When Jesus was born, the Greek language was spoken from Seleucia on the Tigris to Rome and Puteoli, from Pontus and Bithynia to the cities on the Nile. When Jesus was born, not only the princes of the world, like the sons of Herod the Great and the grandsons of Augustus, but also great numbers of the prosperous and great numbers of the common people throughout the Roman Empire, with the partial exception of the European provinces, had been influenced for good by the ethical and religious teaching of Greek philosophy. In respect to numbers and earnestness the preachers of that philosophy have been compared to the representatives of the Salvation Army in England.³

¹ See, e.g., Tacitus, *Agricola* 4, which speaks of Marseilles as a seat of learning where the refinements of Greece were happily blended with the sober manners of provincial economy. See also Mahaffy, *Greek World under Roman Sway*, p. 215.

² See *Stromata*, 1, 5.

³ See Wendland, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

But we must pass on from Augustus and Hellenism to sketch some other features of the stage upon which Jesus entered in the year 749 of Rome. Three years before the birth of Jesus Augustus took a census of Roman citizens, and the number was 4,230,000.¹ Some parts of the Empire were more densely populated than at the present day, but this was not the rule. In the last century long-continued wars had greatly reduced the population, especially of Italy, and the population of Greece had been declining for a hundred years before the battle of Actium.² But while the population of the Empire as a whole was perhaps not above one half of the present population of the same lands, the great cities were without doubt greater than their successors of the twentieth century. Rome and Alexandria, Jerusalem and Antioch, Seleucia and Ephesus and Corinth were more populous than any cities of the same regions at present. If we strike an average between the estimates of Hecataeus and Tacitus, the population of Jerusalem was seven times greater than now.³ As to Rome, Augustus made a donation to 320,000 in his twelfth consulship, and this number, as it was exclusive of slaves and of children under twelve years of age, implies a population from two to four times that of the modern city on the Tiber.⁴ To judge from statements in Josephus and Philo, the population of Alexandria must have exceeded that of any city of Egypt in the present day.⁵

The world into which Jesus was born was not only a world of great cities, but it was also a world of human slavery. This conspicuous feature, though more familiar than some others, demands at least a moment's notice in any attempt to sketch a world-view of his times.

There are certain broad distinctions between modern slavery and that which prevailed when Jesus was born. The modern slave was a negro, wantonly seized and torn from his African home, or was the descendant of such a

¹ See *Mon. Ancy.*, 8.

² See Mommsen, *Provinces of the Roman Empire*, 1, 290.

³ See Bousset, *Die Religion des Judenthums*, 1902, p. 65.

⁴ The mean between the estimates of Bunsen and Merivale is one million.

⁵ See Josephus, *Jewish War*, 2, 18, 8, and Philo, *Contra Flaccum*,

negro; in the time of Augustus, slaves, as a rule, were of the races that inhabited the Roman Empire—Syrians, Greeks, Egyptians, Germans, Gauls, Jews, Illyrians, Parthians and Pannonians, and they were a part of the prize of victorious war.¹ Thus it came about that a man might own a slave who was thoroughly competent to teach his children Greek, and another who was an expert musician, and yet a third who was an able expounder of Greek philosophy. Pliny tells us of a slave by the name of Daphnus who was sold for 700,000 sesterces, or about \$28,000.² This slave was a noted grammarian, and we can readily imagine how eagerly millionaire buyers who wished to shine in society as the owners of distinguished property would have raised their bids to secure him, as some modern millionaires, with less reason, bid against each other for a great collection of autographs or snuff-boxes of the time of Louis XIV. Obviously slaves of such note and value were few, but there were many whose native or acquired talents made them most serviceable to their owners, and of the great mass we can say that they were not separated from their owners by any such chasm as lay between the modern slave population and the ruling class.

The number of slaves in the time of Augustus, both in country and in city, was large. Pliny, whose *Natural History* contains so much valuable information which does not strictly belong to natural history, tells of a certain Claudius Isidorus whose last testament disposed of 264,000 head of cattle and 4116 slaves, not to mention numerous other possessions.³

Augustus had a law enacted which forbade any owner of slaves to free more than one hundred,⁴ which obviously suggests that a good many Roman citizens owned more than a hundred slaves, and also that the unlimited emancipation of slaves in ancient Rome and Italy, as well as in the United States in the nineteenth century, had some serious consequences.

¹ Plutarch in his *Life of Caesar* says that in his campaigns in the North he captured one million people.

² See *Nat. Hist.*, 7, 40.

³ See *Nat. Hist.*, 33, 47.

⁴ See Gardthausen, *op. cit.*, p. 909.

It is but a short step from the slavery of Augustus' day to the next feature which invites our attention, that is, the extreme inequality in respect to outward fortune which characterized all society in the Roman Empire, if we except rude and uncivilized tribes. The great middle class of modern times, who have neither poverty nor riches, was either small or quite lacking when Jesus was born. We have vivid glimpses of the wretchedness of the common man and the luxury of the few. The veterans of Augustus, after twenty or twenty-five years of service, had little to show save bent and scarred forms. To keep them from absolute want Augustus gave them small farms¹—a gift which in *amount* at least is not to be distantly compared with the universal pension of American soldiers. The condition of the great slave population, whose owners had a legal power of life and death and who, if they chose, could kill a slave to feed their fish, may be left to the imagination. Of the people in great cities who were almost always on the verge of starvation the number was certainly much larger than it is today.

That there was vast wealth in the hands of a few in the time of Augustus is perfectly evident. It is only in a few rich cities of our own prosperous age that choice building sites bring as high as a hundred dollars per square foot, but it is estimated that the land on which Augustus erected the temple of Mars cost about double that amount.² No inconsiderable number of millionaires may safely be inferred from the single fact that Augustus in the last twenty years of his reign received in bequests or in gifts from the living the sum of 4,000 million of sesterces, or about \$160,000,000. Had not men succeeded in amassing enormous fortunes, and had they not tasted the power which such fortunes confer, we should not hear Longinus complaining that his generation "deified" wealth. But the rich were few, the masses were poor, and the gulf between was wide. There are glaring inequalities of fortune today, especially in great cities,

¹ See *Mon. Ancyr.*, 16, 19.

² See Gardthausen, *op. cit.*, p. 972.

but they were worse in the world of Augustus, not merely in Italy but also throughout the East.

There was another feature of life in the Roman Empire when Jesus was born which appealed to the society of that day and fascinated it in a manner to which the present offers no parallel. This was the exhibition of mortal combats. While Hellenism built theaters in which the works of the great poets were still presented and stadia for the bloodless contests of youth and for the chariot-race, the Roman genius built the amphitheater where wild beasts with each other, or wild beasts with men, or finally men with men, fought in dead earnest. Augustus is said to have gone beyond all men in the number, variety and magnitude of his solemn shows,¹ and this is amply confirmed by the famous Ancyran inscription. "Three times in my own name," says the old emperor who delighted to play with little children,—“three times in my own name and five times in that of my sons and grandsons I have given gladiatorial exhibitions; in these exhibitions about ten thousand men have fought. Twenty-six times in my own name, or in that of my sons and grandsons, I have given hunts of African wild beasts in the circus, the forum, the amphitheaters, and about 3,500 beasts have been killed.”² He does not say how many *men* lost their lives in this mad conflict with 3,500 African wild beasts. To set forth the lavish manner in which he had entertained his subjects it was enough to mention the prodigious number of wild beasts.

And again Augustus says: “I gave the people the spectacle of a naval battle beyond the Tiber, where now is the grave of the Caesars. For this purpose an excavation was made 1800 feet long and 1200 feet wide. In this contest thirty beaked ships, triremes and biremes, were engaged, besides more of smaller size. About 3,000 men fought in these vessels in addition to the rowers.”³ We are not to fancy that this was a mock battle, given as an illustration of naval tactics like the

¹ See Suetonius, *Augustus*, 43.

² See *Mon. Ancy.*, 22.

³ See *Mon. Ancy.*, 23.

show manœuvres of modern times. Such a battle would not have satisfied the Roman people.

How insatiable was the lust of witnessing these fierce combats and on what a magnificent scale the rulers sought to gratify it is suggested by the calamity that occurred at Fidenæ near Rome. The amphitheater at this place, built by Atilius for sordid gain and not with a worthy municipal ambition, collapsed, and Tacitus informs us that 50,000 people were either killed or injured.¹ When Jesus was born, there were massive amphitheaters in the cities of the East as well as in Italy, and even by the walls of Jerusalem there was one, which as boy or man he doubtless saw.

When Jesus was born, the belief in magic and miracles was universal, but we shall not dwell on this feature in the present survey. That belief is still almost universal. A careful observer of the first century said there was a stone to be found in the Nile, resembling a bean, which if held to the nostril of one who was possessed by an evil spirit, would expel that spirit.² Today thousands of people crowd certain churches or make pilgrimages to shrines in the expectation that sacred reliques or the Virgin Mary will heal their diseases: and sometimes they *are healed*. Likewise in the ancient time evil spirits were doubtless exorcized. There is no essential difference between the two cases. From this whole subject, then, as somewhat familiar, we shall pass at once to the next vantage-point of our world-survey.

Within the large circle of the Roman Empire, over which we have been passing, there was a small circle to whose general condition, when Jesus was born, we must give a few minutes' attention. Without doubt this smaller circle—the region of Palestine—is better known than the large one; but the more familiar ways we will either avoid or traverse swiftly that we may have time for ways and facts that are less familiar.

Herod the Great, an Idumean with a Greek name, a Roman citizen by birth,³ whose ancestors in the previous

¹ See Tacitus, *Annals*, 4, 62.

² See Josephus, *Antiq.*, 14.8.3.

³ See Plutarch's *Miscellanies*, 5, 496.

century had been forced to accept the Jewish law,¹ was about sixty-five years old when Jesus was born. We read in Matthew of his interview with the wise men and the subsequent attempt to destroy the new-born King of the Jews by the indiscriminate slaughter of all the male infants in Bethlehem. This scene—whether historical or legendary we will not stop to inquire—is all that the New Testament tells us about the man who, as Professor Mahaffy says,² was the most interesting Hellenistic figure of the day. We may have read in Josephus³ of Herod's proud and beautiful wife Mariamme, and how he, when his mind had been poisoned by false whisperers, had her strangled, and then in an agonizing revulsion of feeling was rendered more than half insane by his crime and loss. We may have read in the same author⁴ how Herod's two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, educated in Rome and not without noble qualities, were executed at the command of their father, and how, when he himself stood on the brink of the grave, his hatred of another son, Antipater, held death at bay, as it were, until this son also was destroyed. We have heard or read these and similar things, and we think of Herod the Great as a great monster. But there is another side. This man who had ruled Palestine with an iron hand for a full generation,⁵ when Jesus was born, was in point of mental power and force of will worthy to be ranked with the greatest kings who had ever wielded the scepter in Jerusalem. He managed his cause during the vicissitudes of the Civil Wars with eminent ability. The frankness and boldness with which, at Rhodes, he met Octavius, now the master of the world, evoke admiration.⁶ So in like manner does the fact that for thirty-four years he not only maintained himself on his throne in the midst of a people who hated him with a religious hatred, but also improved the material condition of that people. Again and again he remitted a considerable part of the taxes for all his subjects.⁷ He

¹ *Antiq.*, 13.9.1.

² See *Greek World under Roman Sway*, p. 171.

³ See *Jew. War*, 1.22.2-5; *Antiq.*, 15.7.4; 15.7.6-7.

⁴ See *Antiq.*, 16.4.1-6; 8.1-6; 11.1-7; *Jew. War*, 1.23.7.

⁵ He received the Kingdom of Palestine in 37 B.C.

⁶ See *Antiq.*, 15.6.6.

⁷ See *Antiq.*, 15.10.4; 16.2.4.

conceived and executed large plans for municipal and national improvement, not only commercial but also aesthetic and religious. He gave to Jerusalem its first safe and commodious sea-port in the construction of Caesarea. He crushed the robber bands of Galilee. He honored his father in building Antipatris on the way from Caesarea to Jerusalem, and his brother in building Phasaelis in the Jordan valley.¹ He built Sebaste (Samaria) on the road from the capital to Galilee. If he built a theater and an amphitheater at Jerusalem to the scandalizing of all strict Jews,³ he also erected a temple to Jehovah there whose magnificence impressed every beholder, even in an age of extraordinary buildings, and whose glory passed into a proverb.⁴

Nor was the kingly beneficence of Herod confined to Palestine and the Jews. He paved with marble the chief street in Antioch, constructing also a beautiful colonnade on either side;⁵ he restored the temple of Apollo in Rhodes at great cost;⁶ he made donations to the inhabitants of various towns on the coast of Ionia and Lycia; he opened his purse to aid in the building of temples, or for other public improvements, in Damascus and Tripoli, in Byblus and Berytus, Tyre and Sidon, in Athens and Olympia, in Pergamum and Nicopolis.⁷ Most of this money that was so freely lavished on public works far and near may have been veritable mammon of unrighteousness. We know as little how it was amassed as we do how some modern Midases have amassed their fabulous riches: we speak only of the generous and wise manner in which it was expended. It is rather startling to realize that this man at whose domestic crimes the blood runs cold and whose palace in his last years may well have seemed to him to be filled with the ghosts of those whom he had passionately loved and as passionately sacrificed—that this man was also, next to Augustus Caesar himself,

¹ See *Antiq.*, 16.5.2.

² See *Antiq.*, 16.5.1; *Jew. War*, 1.21.2.

³ See *Antiq.*, 15.8.1; 15.11.1-7.

⁴ See *Jew. War*, 1.21.1; 5.5.1-8.

⁵ See *Antiq.*, 16.5.3.

⁶ See *Jew. War*, 1.2.21.11; *Antiq.*, 16.5.3.

⁷ See *Antiq.*, 16.5.3; *Jew. War*, 1.21.8.11.12.

the most widely influential patron of religion not only of his own generation but of all antiquity. Such, however, is the fact, and it is a relief to one's feelings to know something of Herod the Builder if one must know Herod the Destroyer.

There is another feature of the Jewish world into which Jesus was born which, though unfamiliar to many, is of decided interest and value, that is, the Hellenization of the Jews. There can be no doubt that Herod, whose father is said to have been a servant in the temple of Apollo at Ascalon, powerfully promoted this introduction of Greek civilization into his realm, whether as a matter of simple political expediency, or because it appealed to him as superior to the narrow illiberal Judaism of his time, we need not now inquire. Nor shall we seek to answer the question whether in promoting the introduction of Hellenism Herod was a true furtherer of the highest interests of the Jewish people or rather a corrupter of their life. We are concerned here only with the facts themselves.

When Jesus was born, the Greek-speaking man—Greek in blood or Syrian—was a familiar figure in Palestine. There were towns and cities, especially on the western coast and beyond Jordan, that were largely or predominantly Greek. Such were Caesarea by the sea, where Paul was a prisoner for two years, Gaza and Anthedon, Samaria, Gadara and Hippus. The erection of a temple to Augustus in Samaria¹ and another at Paneas² is clear evidence of the presence in those regions of a non-Jewish population, and if non-Jewish, then Greek-speaking. Likewise the existence of theaters and amphitheaters at Caesarea, Jericho, Sebaste and Jerusalem³ argues either the presence of Greek-speaking people in considerable numbers or the wholesale Hellenizing of the Jews. Probably it is evidence of the presence of some people who spoke Greek and of the Hellenizing of some Jews. Moreover the party of the Herodians, who approved Herod's political policy, are not likely to have frowned on his pro-

¹ See *Antiq.*, 17. 8. 2.

² See *Antiq.*, 15.10.3.

³ See *Antiq.*, 15.8.6; 17.8.2; 16.5.1.

motion of closer relations with Rome and the great world by the introduction of Greek and Roman amusements.

Herod's court too was thoroughly Hellenistic. His leading adviser was a Greek from Damascus, another was Eurycles the Spartan.¹ His sons were sent to Rome to be educated.² To judge from historical examples not a few, we should say that if the court of a forceful ruler like Herod was Greek in its tastes and customs, in speech and dress and manner of life, that fact would not be without deep influence on the Jews, to break down their religious prejudice against things foreign.

In addition to these facts—a Hellenistic court, Greek and Roman games and shows, Greek architecture, and the presence of Greek-speaking people in considerable numbers—there was a steady and powerful influence toward Hellenism flowing from contact with those Jews who came from all parts of the Empire to worship at Jerusalem. When Jesus was born, there were probably as many Jews living abroad as there were in the homeland, and these foreign Jews were not inferior in wealth to those of Palestine. They remained true to their paternal faith, but they were liberalized. It was a commercial necessity that they should mingle with the Gentiles, if they were to succeed. It was necessary to learn the tongues of the Gentiles, especially Greek, which was spoken or understood almost everywhere.³

Now this intimate contact with Greek civilization had already continued several generations before the time of which we speak. Multitudes of Jews therefore spoke Greek as their native tongue, just as multitudes of their descendants in New York today, whose fathers came from Russia or Poland, speak English as their native tongue. These Jews of the Dispersion at the time of Jesus' birth, when they returned to Jerusalem and met old friends or made new ones, inevitably, though often unconsciously, sowed the seeds of that Greek civilization in which they lived and moved. They could not have

¹ See *Jew. War*, 1.26.1; *Antiq.*, 16.2.3; 12.3.2; Philo, *Ambassadors*, 31, 33, 36.

² See *Antiq.*, 15.10.1.

³ See Mahaffy, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

helped so doing any more than the Americanized Italians or Slavs of today, when they return to their old homes can help carrying with them certain evidences of the influence of our republican institutions.

Thus at the birth of Jesus the Jews of Palestine had deeply felt the influence of that great Hellenistic movement which began with the campaigns of Alexander. Its traces were evident to the eye as one journeyed about the country. They came into the hand as often as one handled a gold coin, for these bore the image of Augustus and came from his mint in Rome, or when one passed the more common coins of Herod with their Greek inscriptions. Traces of that movement were evident to the ear on the streets of many cities and towns. And finally, when the Jews from abroad came up to Jerusalem, bringing rich gifts for the temple and with minds broadened by contact with Greek thought, their influence on the native population was but a part of the great process of Hellenization which Alexander had originated.

Having now completed our too rapid survey of the world at the birth of Jesus it remains to sketch what was happening near and far while he was living his quiet life in Nazareth and then for a little space was setting in motion in Galilee and Judea those forces which have given its greatest distinction to all subsequent history.

The year 750 of Rome, or 4 B.C., was momentous for the kingdom of Herod the Great. His death, which occurred in the spring of that year,¹ was announced to his soldiers in the amphitheater at Jericho, in which city he had died; there, too, his will was read, and Archelaus his son was acclaimed king, subject of course to the approval of Augustus. When the dead ruler, borne upon a golden bier that was covered with purple and adorned with precious stones, his scepter in his hand and a crown of gold upon his head, had been brought up the steep road from Jericho to his tomb in the rugged fortress of Herodeum a few miles distant from Jerusalem, followed by a long line of foreign soldiers and these followed by

¹ See Schürer, *Hist. of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ*, Div. 1, vol. 1, p. 464, Note 165.

five hundred servants of the palace bearing spices,¹ then began a period of terror and confusion that must have filled the whole land with dismal forebodings. Before the sacred feast of the Passover was completed—one wonders whether Joseph and Mary were present, or any of their neighbors in Nazareth—Archelaus, to suppress the persistent disturbances of the multitude about the temple slew of them three thousand people.² But while he was in Rome seeking to secure for himself his father's throne, matters rapidly went from bad to worse. Sabinus, the Roman who had been sent to manage affairs in the interim, plundered the temple,³ and the revolt became more bitter and wide-spread. Discontent with the general condition of things, long smothered, now shot out lurid flames in various parts of the land.⁴ The report of this brought down Varus, Governor of Syria, with an army of many thousands. The city of Sepphoris, a few miles north of Nazareth and visible from the Nazareth hills, was given to the flames and its inhabitants sold into slavery.⁵ Thence the army proceeded to Jerusalem, and having crushed the revolt there, companies of soldiers went throughout the land in search of those who were suspected of being favorable to the revolution. Of such they seized and crucified two thousand.⁶ It is not improbable that some crosses were set up in Nazareth. Certain it is that Jesus must have heard, even from childhood, of this Roman mode of execution.

Following this short reign of terror came the reestablishment of order under the sons of Herod. Galilee and Perea were given to Antipas, Judea, Samaria and Idumea to Archelaus, the region to the north and east of Galilee to Philip, while one city in the Jordan valley, two on the western sea and the palace in Ascalon went to Salome, sister of Herod the Great.⁷ Antipas, to whom Jesus paid taxes as a citizen of Nazareth, was, like Archelaus,

¹ See *Antiq.*, 17.8.1-4.

² See *Jew. War*, 2.1.3.

³ See *Antiq.*, 17.9.3; 17.10.1-2.

⁴ See *Antiq.*, 17.10.4-8.

⁵ See *Antiq.*, 17.10.9.

⁶ See *Antiq.*, 17.10.10.

⁷ See *Antiq.*, 17.11.4.

half Samaritan and half Idumean,¹ while Philip, son of a Cleopatra of Jerusalem,² was probably half Jewish. Herod the Great, like Henry VIII of England, was often married, and among his wives were at least one Samaritan, several Jewesses, and possibly two or three Greeks.

We must glance at each of these sons of Herod. Our interest in Philip is due mainly to the fact that certain important events in the life of Jesus transpired in his domain. He was a person of moderation and quietness in the conduct of his life and government.³ He stayed among his own subjects, and was always ready to settle disputes between man and man. The income of his domain was about one hundred talents⁴—somewhat more than one hundred thousand dollars—and as Augustus restored to the children of Herod the royal bequest which their father had made to him,⁵ a considerable sum must have fallen to Philip. Of these revenues he spent large amounts on the enlarging of Paneas, where his father had built a marble temple to Augustus, a city that henceforth bore the name Caesarea Philippi, and upon the restoration and enlargement of Bethsaida, a town on the left of the Jordan at its entrance into the Lake of Galilee, to which, in honor of the daughter of Augustus, he gave the name Julias.⁶

Antipas, of whom Jesus was a subject and through whose rash vow John the Baptist came to his death, had double the income of Philip,⁷ but lacked his moral worth. He intrigued with Herodias, his brother's wife, and took her as his own, and would have divorced his former wife who was an Arabian and a king's daughter had not she, becoming acquainted with his plan, fled to her father Aretas, whence in due time there arose a war for Antipas and with it great loss.⁸ To the ambition of Herodias it was also due that Antipas, seeking further honor from the Roman emperor lost what he had, and ended his life in banishment in the West.⁹ This was about ten years

¹ See *Antiq.*, 17.1.3.

² See *Jew. War*, 1.28.4.

³ See *Antiq.*, 18.4.6.

⁴ See *Antiq.*, 17.11.4.

⁵ See *Antiq.*, 17.11.5.

⁶ See *Antiq.*, 18.2.1.

⁷ See *Antiq.*, 17.11.4.

⁸ See *Antiq.*, 18.5.1.

⁹ See *Antiq.*, 18.7.1-2.

after the crucifixion of Jesus. It should be added that Herodias, though having an opportunity to live in comfort on an estate in Palestine, chose to share her husband's exile.

In the boyhood of Jesus Antipas resided in Sepphoris,¹ which had been rebuilt and surrounded with strong walls, and it would be strange if the Nazareth boy never saw him as he came or went with his princely retinue. Later, probably in the young manhood of Jesus, Antipas built a royal residence on the south-west of the Lake of Galilee, whose stadium and splendid marble buildings Jesus must often have seen at a distance, even if he never entered the city.²

As Antipas was worse than Philip, so Archelaus was worse than Antipas. His treatment both of the Jews and the Samaritans was so barbarous,³ and his hand so heavy both on the rich and the poor, that the chief men of Judea and Samaria went to Rome and accused him to the Emperor, with the fortunate result that he was stripped of his possessions and banished to Gaul. This took place when Jesus was about eleven years old. In his short reign Archelaus had built a magnificent palace in Jericho, had set out a large grove of palms north of that city for which he provided an artificial system of irrigation, and had built a town that bore his own slightly modified name, Archelaïs.⁴ This town and palm-grove and palace must have been familiar sights to Jesus.

With this glance at the men who came into power in Palestine when Jesus was a very young child, we shall turn to some happenings afar off, remembering always the close contact of Palestine with the city of Augustus on the Tiber.

An important event marked the year 2 B.C., when Jesus was about three years old. The temple of Mars in Rome, purposed by Julius Caesar and vowed by Octavius before the battle of Actium,⁵ an edifice which had been eighteen years in process of erection and on which untold riches

¹ See *Antiq.*, 18.2.1; *Josephus, Life*, 67.

² See *Antiq.*, 18.2.3; *Jew. War*, 2.7.3.

³ See *Jew. War*, 2.7.3.

⁴ See *Antiq.*, 17.13.1.

⁵ See Gardthausen, *op. cit.*, pp. 971-972.

had been lavished, was solemnly dedicated in August of that year. In its magnificence and in the costliness and beauty of its adorning it might compare with the temple of Jehovah in Jerusalem which Herod the Great had begun to build at about the same time that Augustus began his temple to Mars.¹ Treasures of Greek statuary in bronze and marble, some of which were centuries old, and paintings by Apelles, gave to its stately halls the charm of rich antiquity.

In his *Ode on the Nativity* Milton fancies that all the gods of the peoples felt the "dreaded hand" of the infant Jesus, and fled away as shadows before the sun. But this was hardly more than a fancy. Mars, the god of war, to whom this magnificent temple was consecrated in the infancy of Jesus, not to mention other gods and goddesses to whom, under Augustus, new and beautiful temples arose, seems not to have felt the "dreaded infant's hand." On the contrary, there went forth from this very temple, in 26 A.D., that procurator Pontius Pilate who issued the death-warrant of Jesus of Nazareth.²

Coming forward three years, to 1 A.D., when Jesus was about five, we hear the applause at Olympia when Tiberius the future Emperor won the chariot-race,³ not as modern kings and great men win similar races by means of high-salaried jockeys, but by his own skill and brawn. To this man, who was to succeed Augustus, Pilate must have reported the execution of a Jewish pretender and two robbers, if indeed this was considered a matter of sufficient note to be reported to the Emperor.

The year 6 A.D., when Jesus was now a boy of about eleven, was one the events of which must have deeply impressed his young mind. It was the year—as we have seen—that Archelaus was summoned to Rome to answer his accusers before Caesar. It was also the year when Judea, and so Jerusalem with the holy temple, came under the direct control of Roman procurators, which form of government continued, with the exception of four years under Agrippa I (41-44 A.D.), until the outbreak of the

¹ See *Antiq.*, 15.11.1.

² See Gardthausen, *op. cit.*, 1:3, p. 1111.

³ See Suetonius, *Augustus*, 29.

war that ended with the complete destruction of Jerusalem. Of these Roman rulers there were five during the life-time of Jesus.¹

Again, it was in 6 A.D. that Cyrenius, Governor of Syria, made an assessment of the property of all the people of Palestine.² Joseph the carpenter must have been visited by some agent of Cyrenius, to whom he was obliged to declare what goods and property he possessed. This visit of the assessors Jesus would naturally have followed with boyish curiosity.

But this year when Jesus was eleven was memorable for another and even more exciting event. On an almost inaccessible rocky height on the south-east shore of the Lake of Galilee was perched the city of Gamala.³ From this place sprang a certain Judas⁴ to whom the Roman assessment seems to have come as a trumpet-call to arise and deliver his people from the foreign yoke. This man with a companion named Sadduc are dignified by the Jewish historian as the founders of a *philosophical* sect,⁵ whose philosophy, however, seems to have consisted chiefly in the belief that they ought to be free from foreign rule and that they *would* be free at all costs.⁶ Men of Galilee rallied to the standard of Judas, only to be cut down and dispersed by the Romans.⁷ He did not see the day of deliverance, but the movement which he inaugurated—the party of the Zealots which he called into existence—went forward, Josephus says,⁸ until the nation was infected to an incredible degree. There can be little doubt that Jesus, living in Galilee where zealotism was strongest, often heard men talk of Judas and of his way of getting free from Rome; and it is a fact of great interest that he not only refused to be carried away by this movement for immediate political liberty, but that he

¹ They were Coponius (6 A.D.-?), Marcus Ambivius (?-10 A.D.), Annius Rufus (10-14 A.D.), Valerius Gratus (14-26 A.D.) and Pontius Pilate (26-36 A.D.).

² See *Antiq.*, 17.13.5; 18.1.1; 18.2.1.

³ See *Jew. War*, 4.1.1.

⁴ See *Antiq.*, 18.1.1-6; *Jew. War*, 2.8.1.

⁵ See *Antiq.*, 18.1.1.

⁶ See *Antiq.*, 18.1.6.

⁷ See Acts 5:37.

⁸ See *Antiq.*, 18.1.1.

also found one of his twelve apostles among the adherents of Judas of Gamala.¹

In 14 A.D., when Jesus was nineteen years old and at work as a carpenter, the news came to Nazareth that the old Emperor, who for more than fifty years had been the dominant genius of the Roman world, had passed away.² In the following months Jesus may have heard how the spirit of Augustus had been seen ascending from the funeral pyre to heaven,³ and of the magnificent temple which was being erected in Rome for his worship.⁴ For with the death of Augustus, his worship, hitherto mainly confined to the eastern provinces, became a part also of the religious life of the Latin people. The historian Tacitus informs us that a temple and divine worship were decreed for Augustus immediately after his death.⁵ Soon a college of priests, twenty-five in number, sacred to the deity of Augustus, was established to have charge of his worship.⁶

When Herod the Great died, the people of Palestine rejoiced; when Augustus died, the Roman people and all the provinces built temples for his worship. If the name of Jesus is mentioned the world over in connection with the feast of December twenty-fifth, so the name of Augustus is mentioned as often as we name the eighth month of the year. We may well credit the statement of the historian Suetonius when he says that Augustus had a "pair of clear and shining eyes in which was seated a kind of divine vigor."⁷ He fulfilled a lofty mission in his day, and for centuries his name far outshone that of Jesus; but now the student of history can see that the most abiding significance of his great work lay in the fact that it was contributory to the spread of Christianity. Velleius Paterculus, writing a few years after the death of Augustus, refers to that event in these significant words: "Whereas we had dreaded the total ruin of the

¹ See Luke 6:15.

² Augustus died Aug. 19.

³ See Gardthausen, 1:3, pp. 1276-1277.

⁴ See Velleius Paterculus, *Rom. Hist.*, 2, 130.

⁵ See *Annals*, 1; also Eutropius, *op. cit.*, 7, 10.

⁶ See Tacitus, *Annals*, 1.

⁷ See his *Augustus*, 79.

world, we did not perceive that it felt the slightest shock."¹ This suggests one way, perhaps the supreme one, in which Augustus unconsciously coöperated with Jesus. He established order throughout the Roman Empire so firmly that it survived his death and remained unshaken for centuries.

It does not concern us to speak at length of Tiberius, the step-son of Augustus, who was ruler of the Roman world in the latter part of the life of Jesus and for some years beyond his death. Only what Tacitus says² of his attitude toward the question of erecting altars and temples for his worship, as had been done in the case of Augustus, shall be noticed. Tiberius said that he had at first followed the example of the deified Augustus and had allowed the cities of Asia to render him worship, but had decided that to allow the extension of this worship in all places would denote a vain spirit and a heart swelled with ambition. "I am a mortal man," he said; "I am confined to the functions of human nature; and if I well supply the principal place among you, it suffices me. Posterity will do abundant right to my memory if they shall believe me to have been worthy of my ancestors, watchful of the Roman state, unmoved in perils, fearless of private enmities." These sentiments are not unworthy of a king. This was the man in whose honor Antipas named his new capital by the Lake of Galilee, that city which probably brought nearest to Nazareth the splendor of Greek architecture and the excitement of the Greek and Roman amusements.³

Tacitus says⁴ that the appointments of Tiberius could not have been better, but one wonders what the outcome of the ministry of Jesus would have been had Tiberius sent as procurator to Judea, in the place of Pilate, a man who was not only capable of recognizing the innocence of Jesus, as Pilate did, but who also had the courage and strength to acquit the innocent.

¹ See his *Rom. Hist.*, 2, 124.

² See *Annals*, 4.

³ Sepphoris was nearer to Nazareth than was Tiberias, and as it was at first the capital, there may have been a theater and an amphitheater there.

⁴ See *Annals*, 4.

And now our survey of what transpired in the life-time of Jesus has little further to record. An echo of the calamity which befel "twelve noble cities of Asia,"¹ overthrown by an earthquake in a single night in the year 16 A.D., when Jesus was about twenty-one years old, may well have reached Nazareth, as also a report of the death of the noble Germanicus at Epidaphne near Antioch in 19 A.D., and of the pomp with which his ashes were borne the following spring from Brundisium to Rome and there received with universal sorrow. The name of Germanicus reminds us again that the world of Jesus' day was not barren either of able or of worthy men.²

In the year 29 A.D., in which we assume that the ministry of Jesus terminated, there died in Rome at the age of more than eighty the foremost woman of that time, Livia, wife of Augustus and mother of Tiberius. The Roman people would have accorded her divine honors, like those accorded to Augustus, had not Tiberius objected.³ There were coins, minted in her life-time, that bore her image and the title "goddess." She was faithful to her husband, and like him lived very simply, though possessed of great wealth in her own name. Like the "worthy woman" of Hebrew literature, she sought wool and flax and worked willingly with her own hands. Strength and dignity were her clothing. She gave liberally for education and to provide marriage portions for poor girls.⁴

That there were serious defects in her character, judged from our point of view, is quite obvious. She allowed a divine name to be given to her, and she was strongly suspected of using unworthy means in securing the succession to her son Tiberius; but judged by the standards of her time and people she was eminent in respect to character as well as ability. It would have seemed the extreme of folly had one who was acquainted both with Livia and with the Jewish teacher who, in the year of her death, was crucified with malefactors, made

¹ See *Annals*, 2.

² See the judgment of Tacitus, *Annals*, 2.

³ See *Annals*, 5.

⁴ See *Annals*, 5; also Gardthausen, op. cit., 1:2, pp. 1018-1030.

bold to mention the two together as belonging to the same class of world-benefactors, and as destined alike to an enduring fame. But now she is "divine" only on the ancient coins in museums of history, while the teaching and spirit of that Jewish carpenter are the inspiration and the goal of the ruling nations of the world.

A few words in conclusion comparing the world into which Jesus was born with that in which we live. Politically that world was a unit, while the same geographical boundaries include today a part of the territory of six great European and Asiatic powers. These are now at peace,¹ but are prepared for war with standing armies several times as large as that which sufficed for Augustus. He dedicated an altar of Peace on the fourth of July, 741, eight years before Jesus was born: the nations among whom his empire is now divided helped to establish the Permanent Court of Arbitration at the Hague on July twenty-nine, 1899, and they seek to promote peace by an amount of intelligent public opinion and by an international organization to which the Roman world in Jesus' day did not offer the remotest parallel.

Industrially that world into which Jesus was born enjoyed a large measure of prosperity, which in Palestine and Syria, in Asia Minor and Mauretania, far surpassed what those lands can show at the present time.

Socially that world, though made acquainted with the idea of human brotherhood by the teaching of the Greek philosophers, was a world in which the institution of slavery was conspicuous, and in which, excepting the Germans and the Jews, people paid little respect to the marriage bond. But slavery is no longer found within the borders of the Empire of Augustus, and as for domestic virtue it is safe to say that public opinion even in Turkey, Egypt or Persia would not tolerate in high officials what Roman society jested over in Augustus' day.

Intellectually the condition of the world in Jesus' day was not wholly unworthy to be compared with the present condition throughout the same regions. The small class

¹ Since these words were written, war has been waged between Italy and Turkey.

who were trained in philosophy and law, in literature and art, were probably the equals of their successors of the present day; but the technical schools, as that for mathematics at Alexandria and those for medicine in the Greek islands, have been surpassed both in method and in knowledge by institutions of our time within the ancient realm of Augustus. As regards the intelligence and culture of the mass of the people, the present average in some parts of the former Roman Empire, as western Germany, France, Switzerland and Austria south of the Danube, is probably much higher than the average in *any* considerable part of the Augustan world.

Religiously the world of Jesus' day offers a parallel and a contrast to the same region at the beginning of the twentieth century. Religious rites and writings filled as large a place in the public mind then as they do now. The highest type of pagan ethics and life of the period with which we are occupied, as seen, for example, in Octavia and Germanicus, Agrippa, Maecenas and Plutarch, might bear comparison with the best types of Christian ethics and life to be found in the realm where Augustus ruled. Now as then there is a large element of superstition in religious thought and life, whether we look at Mohammedanism which dominates the eastern and southern parts of the old Roman Empire or at the Christianity which is prominent in its western part.

But there is a contrast as well as a parallel. The larger part of the population of the Roman Empire when Jesus was born believed in the existence of many gods, while the entire present population of the same region believes in the existence of one God only. Again, the religious propaganda of that age, though characterized by great earnestness and perseverance, especially among the Jews and the preachers of Greek philosophy, when compared with the religious propaganda in the same regions today, presents a significant contrast. The Jewish missionary brought his convert into the synagogue and to the reading of the Old Testament, but both he and the preacher of Greek ethics failed to conserve and accumulate the fruits of their labors. At present there is

a religious propaganda in the region where Augustus once ruled, represented by such institutions as Robert College in Constantinople, which is of a far different sort. It has an assurance of faith that is born of many generations of triumphant labor and has a breadth of outlook which was wanting to that earlier propaganda. It builds great institutions that are sure to multiply themselves in coming time. It has appropriated the wisdom of the past and the results of modern science, and is making them contribute to the realization of the ideal of Christian manhood.

In our last word we turn from the world of Jesus' day to the spread of the Jesus' faith in our own day. The Roman Empire was not a tenth as large as our modern world, and probably had not more than a twentieth as many inhabitants. Out of this ten-fold larger modern world might be carved two empires, each as vast as that of Augustus, the genius of whose civilization is inseparable from the historical work of Jesus; and throughout the remaining region, eight times as large as the Roman world, wherever the quickening of life is deepest and most hopeful, and the outreaching after better things is most determined, there too this movement appears to be related to the message of Jesus as the effect is related to its cause.

CHAPTER II

ORIGIN AND EARLY LIFE

BACK of the earliest Gospel was the *Logia*—that collection of the words of Jesus which is preserved for us in Matthew and Luke, and to this, as the most ancient documentary source of Christianity, we first turn for light on the Master's birth and private life. And we turn to it as a source which is peculiarly sacred and full of authority. If Jesus himself gives us *any* information on his parentage or private life, that should be regarded as final; if, however, he is silent, that fact also is of primary importance.

Now we might expect in advance that such a document as the *Logia* would contain some direct references to the past life of Jesus and some references also that were indirect. We find, however, on examination that this collection of the Lord's words contains no direct allusion whatever to his parentage, or his birth, or to any single specific incident of his private life.¹

There are, however, in the *Logia* many words which may have a certain indirect autobiographical value. It is not to be supposed that the inner spiritual life of Jesus was radically different *after* his baptism from what it had been before. His response to the summons of the Baptist and the assurance, received at the Jordan, that he was called to the Messianic office, gave a new *expression* to his life—turned it into a new channel—but as far as we know did not alter its quality or change its method either of acquiring or of using truth. We are to suppose, then, that the public teaching of Jesus was deeply rooted in his private life, that it was not something that came to him

¹ Mt. 10:36 is reminiscent of Micah 7:6, but even if one sees in it an autobiographical allusion (cf. Mk. 6:4), it does not necessarily refer back to Jesus' *private* life.

with the Jordan experience. It was the outcome of many years of thought, many years of walking with God in the obscure period before his baptism. It was then that he stored up those deep observations of the ways of men which mark his teaching, then that he pondered the forms and processes of the natural world and learned to speak in parables, then that he gained his mastery of the principles of the Law and the Prophets, then that he reached conclusions on the need of his people and the unsatisfactoriness of the ministry in synagogue and temple, then that he learned to trust God and not be anxious, then that he discovered the secret of living and attained true peace, then, in short, that he was prepared to see the heavens opened and to hear a voice out of heaven saying, "Thou art my beloved Son."

If then the public teaching of Jesus, that is, its fundamental principles rather than its details, flowered out of his past life, we should expect to find that many of his words look as though born of his own experience, and that is what we do find. When his disciples asked him to teach them to pray as John also taught his disciples,¹ and he in response gave them a form of prayer, it is most natural to see in this the ripe fruit of his own experience. When he made the birds of the heaven and the lilies of the field teach deep lessons of life,² when he spoke of different ways of building,³ when he declared the power of faith⁴ and the certainty that he who asks shall receive,⁵ when he invited others to share his yoke and burden,⁶ he was giving glimpses into his own past life. So in like manner when he contrasted his own appearance with that of John the Baptist and said that the Son of Man came eating and drinking,⁷ he intimated that his life had been that of a normal man. The illustrations that he employed in his teaching indicate that he had lived in the country rather than in the city, and with the poor rather than with the rich.⁸

¹ Lk. 11:2-4.

² Mt. 6:26-30.

³ Mt. 7:24-27.

⁴ Mt. 17:20.

⁵ Mt. 7:8.

⁶ Mt. 11:28.

⁷ Mt. 11:19.

⁸ See in addition to the passages just cited Mt. 7:9-10; 8:20; 9:37-38; 10:16, 29; 12:33, 34; 13:12-14; 24:28.

But while the light which these passages throw on the private life of Jesus is of great value, it does not enable one to write a history or even a sketch of those years.

It was said above that the *Logia* contains no direct allusion to the parentage or birth of Jesus. There is, however, a word of Jesus found in all the synoptists which, whether it stood in the *Logia* or not, is of unquestioned genuineness, and which does allude to his family. This is Mark 3:33-34 (Matt. 12:48-50; Lk. 8:21). The word is inseparable from the preceding incident. The mother and brothers of Jesus had come where he was teaching, apparently in or near Capernaum,¹ and sending to him in the house asked him to come forth. He said in reply that those who were seated about him, listening to his words, were his mother and his brothers. He admitted a physical kinship with those who stood outside and who requested him to come forth, but he set this over against a kinship of spirit. This is the only direct allusion to his family made by Jesus in the synoptic Gospels, and it is significant. It gives no names, but we learn from it that Jesus belonged to a family of several members, and that they were not in sympathy with his present course of action. This passage, however, does not necessarily imply that, before Jesus came forward as a public teacher, there had been lack of harmony between him and his home circle. The change in his outward life was so radical and surprising in its nature that it obviously might disturb the most friendly relationships.

This solitary passage therefore in which Jesus alluded to his family does not throw any clear light into the past beyond the information that he had a mother and brothers. From the circumstance that a father is not mentioned here we must not draw too large a conclusion. The silence would be explicable if the father was no longer alive, but this single passage by itself does not justify us in saying that he was dead. We may find some support for that view elsewhere, but now we are concerned simply with words that are attributed to Jesus himself. These words would allow us to suppose that the father

¹ Mk. 3:20, margin of Rev. Ver.

was alive, but was not willing to share in the attempt which his wife and sons were making to turn Jesus from his public work. We must therefore leave this point for the present unsettled.

There is another word of Jesus, recorded by all the synoptists, which demands consideration in this connection because of its bearing on his lineage. The various factions that were opposed to him had been trying him, on a certain occasion,¹ with crafty question—first the Herodians with the Pharisees, then the Sadducees, and finally a scribe. When the questions thus raised had been disposed of, Jesus in his turn asked a question, which concerned the descent of the Messiah. He began with a reference to the view of the scribes who traced the Messiah's genealogy to David.² He then quoted from Ps. 110, which was regarded as Messianic, and asked how one whom David had called "Lord" could be his "son." He seems to have regarded this as an unanswerable question, and as a plain refutation of the view of the scribes.

But what was the *aim* of Jesus in these words? Was it to set forth his own belief regarding the descent of the Messiah, or was it to silence those who were asking questions which were more academic than vital? We are told that he once silenced the leaders in the temple by a question in regard to the baptism performed by John.³ It is possible that on this occasion also his primary motive was to silence the adversaries. For Jesus must have known that there are certain Old Testament passages which clearly involve the Davidic descent of the Messiah, e.g., Mic. 5:2; Is. 9:7; 11:1, and we are hardly justified in supposing that he set all these aside in favor of an apparently counter statement in Ps. 110. But if the chief motive of Jesus was to silence his opponents

¹ See Mk. 12:13-17 (=Matt. 22:15-22; Lk. 20:20-26); Mk. 12:18-27 (=Matt. 22:23-33; Lk. 20:27-38); Mk. 12:28-34 (=Matt. 22:34-40; Lk. 20:39-40, 10:25-28).

² Mk. 12:35. Mt. 22:41 ascribes this view to the *Pharisees*, and Lk. does not directly intimate who the holders of it were (20:41). The N. T. writings nowhere directly espouse a different view of the Messiah's descent. See Mt. 1:1; Lk. 1:27, 69; Jn. 7:42; Rom. 1:3; 2 Tim. 2:8; Rev. 5:5; 22:16. However, since the Davidic lineage always carries the idea of the Messiah as a *ruler*, those passages in which he is thought of as the *prophet* of Dt. 18:15 turn us away from Davidic descent rather than toward it.

³ Mk. 11:30.

and put an end to idle questions, then we can hardly use this verse as a clear proof of his belief that the Messiah was *not* of Davidic descent. But if we allow it any bearing whatever on his thought of his own lineage, we must admit that it is against his claiming to be in the Davidic line.¹

It is easy to sum up all the information that Jesus himself gives us in regard to his origin. He refers to a mother and brothers, and his general teaching suggests that his private life had been spent in the country, in contact with men, especially those of the humbler sort, and that it had been a normal life. If we consider that the reference to mother and brothers was called out by circumstances over which Jesus had no control, we see that, as far as the synoptic record informs us, he had *nothing* to say to his disciples either about his origin or his early life. We must infer, then, that he did not consider it important for his disciples that he should talk with them on these subjects.

But we are not yet through with the historical data which concern the life of Jesus prior to his public ministry. We have considered the *Logia* and some other words of Jesus. We now turn to the earliest evangelist and ask what light, if any, he throws upon the subject.

Mark begins with the work of John the Baptist and his first reference to Jesus (1:9) is that he came from Nazareth of Galilee to John's baptism. He makes no allusion in this place to his earlier life nor to his parentage. Later, in the account of the early Galilean career of Jesus, Mark records, as we have seen, the incident of the mother and brothers of Jesus, but evidently not for the sake of making his readers acquainted with the origin and family of his hero. In the rest of his narrative there is one other passage which incidentally relates to the home and private life of Jesus. This is the account of a visit which Jesus made in Nazareth.² We learn from this that the

¹ The fact that Jesus seems to have allowed men, on one occasion at least, to address him as "Son of David" (Mk. 10:47; Lk. 18:38; Mt. 20:30) has no significance for the question of his physical descent. This term was a popular equivalent of "Messiah."

² Mk. 6:1-6; Mt. 13:53-58; cf. Lk. 4:16-30.

mother of Jesus, like the sister of Moses, bore the name Miriam or Mary,¹ that he was a member of a large family, hence a family which, according to the Hebrew conception, Jehovah had signally blessed,² and that there was nothing in the position or history of this family—nothing known to the people of Nazareth—which justified the public appearance of one of its members as a teacher in Israel. For his neighbors would not have spoken as they did—"Whence hath this man these things? . . . Is not this the carpenter, the Son of Mary?"—if Jesus had been a pupil of the rabbis and had been trained by them in the interpretation of the Scriptures, for obviously in that case his appearance as a teacher need have occasioned no surprise. This passage has a bearing also on the claim which was made at a later time, that Jesus was descended from David. If it had been known to the people of Nazareth that the family of Joseph was of the royal Davidic lineage, they could hardly have been so greatly astonished at the assumption of a public rôle by a member of that family. These words therefore afford strong evidence that the Nazarenes—people who were acquainted with Joseph's family—knew nothing of its Davidic descent.

But the question may be raised whether, *if the life of Jesus in past years had been just like the common life of Nazareth*, the people would have regarded his appearance in the new rôle with such indignation, and would not rather have taken pride in the fact that one of their number had become famous. It may not be wrong to infer from the warmth of their opposition to him that his life had *not* been just like theirs, but that by a superior moral quality and perhaps by an aggressive righteousness it had silently or otherwise made them feel that they were not approved by Jesus and thus made them hostile toward him. But this cannot be stated with positiveness.

It will be noticed that this incident recorded by Mark and Matthew goes somewhat further than those words of Jesus which we have considered. We now hear not

¹ Mt. writes it, as in the Septuagint of Ex. 15:20, *Μαριάμ*.

² See, e.g., Ps. 127:3-5.

only of a mother and brothers but their names are given, the number of brothers is mentioned, reference is made also to sisters, and most important of all, we are told that Jesus was a carpenter.¹ This last item of information, though not directly supported by anything in the Gospels, is not therefore to be questioned. It accords with the words of Jesus in this respect that they also point to a background of humble life. It is the first specific fact that we have found regarding his private life on its external side, and it is also the *only* one we have. We may almost forgive the people of Nazareth their unbelief if—as seems to be the case—we should not otherwise have known that Jesus was a carpenter.

The earliest Gospel affords us no further light on the origin or private life of Jesus. Even this that it gives is wholly incidental. The author has no desire to instruct his readers on this subject. His writing is devoted exclusively to the Lord's public ministry. Now this fact would be significant even if we knew nothing of Mark's sources; it is the more significant when we remember that one of his sources—perhaps the chief one—was Peter. This apostle, one of the most intimate friends of Jesus, is likely to have known whatever Jesus said at any time about his early life, and had Peter in his teaching communicated any information on this subject, it is probable that Mark would have preserved it. Therefore Mark's silence naturally suggests that Peter also was silent.

We are now at the end of our historical data in regard to the origin and the early life of Jesus.² They are meagre, perhaps disappointing to some readers, but they are harmonious with the known career of Jesus, and they contain one element that must be more and more satisfying as it is duly weighed. We say that these meagre data are harmonious with the known career of Jesus. That he came from Nazareth of Galilee, that he was a carpenter by trade, that his townsmen knew nothing

¹ On Matthew's modification of Mark's language see Part I, ¶ 7, p. 18.

² The first two chapters of Matthew and the first three of Luke must be considered elsewhere. See Part III, chapter I.

of his past life or of his family which justified his appearance as a public teacher, that he was a member of a large family and had lived in contact with men rather than as a recluse—all these circumstances are in intimate accord with the well known facts of the public life of Jesus. Thus the statement that he came from the small and obscure town of Nazareth agrees well with such facts as that he chose his disciples from the humbler walks of life, that he knew how to get near to the lowest and to attract them, and that the rabbis from the first looked askance upon him as an unqualified and unauthorized teacher. That he was a Galilean accords well with the fact that nearly the whole of his public ministry was passed in Galilee and Perea; that his townspeople knew of nothing remarkable in his past life or in the position of his family is in harmony with the fact that in his work he relied neither on great claims nor on striking acts, but on the quiet force of truth; and finally, that he had lived in contact with men agrees well with such facts as his knowledge of all sorts of character and his reliance on the influence of personal fellowship rather than on written words.

These data are fit though meagre. And it must never be forgotten that this meagreness expresses the wish of the Master himself; that he did not speak to his disciples about his parentage and early life; that, so far as they were concerned, his own past was simply ignored. We may therefore rest assured that in the judgment of him who was the wisest of teachers a knowledge of that past was, for his disciples, neither necessary nor even desirable. The time soon came when the imagination of well meaning Christians began to fill out that initial blank-page, and different persons did it in different ways. It will be well for the Church when it learns to distinguish between what the Master said of himself and what others, even in very ancient times, said about him.

CHAPTER III

ENTRANCE INTO PUBLIC LIFE

THAT which drew Jesus from the deep privacy of Nazareth, and brought about the great crisis of his life, was a wide-spread and profound religious movement, originated by John the Baptist. Of this man and his work we have some definite information in the *Logia*. Indeed, it seems that this ancient document began with some account of John's appearance and preaching, for Mt. 3:12 and Lk. 3:17 imply that some such statement preceded in the *Logia* as we have in Mark 1:7-8. From this initial statement we learn that John was an effective preacher of repentance, and also that he announced a successor who was mightier than he and of far greater dignity, one who would judge Israel and divide the wheat from the chaff.¹

A second passage in the *Logia* leads us to our most important source of information, for it gives Jesus' own estimate of the Baptist. The preacher of repentance was now in prison.² A report of the deeds of Jesus reached him, and he sent asking Jesus the direct question, "Art thou the coming one, or are we to look for another?"³ To this question Jesus did not answer with yes or no, but indirectly. He bade the messengers report to John what they saw and heard.⁴ The imprisoned man would thus be in as favorable a position to judge of Jesus as other people were. But we are told that Jesus summed up what was seen and heard in words borrowed from certain Messianic passages of the Old Testament,⁵ adding a beatitude for those who should find no occasion of

¹ Mt. 3:7-10, 12; Lk. 3:7-9, 17.

² Mt. 11:2; Lk. 3:20.

³ Mt. 11:3; Lk. 7:19.

⁴ Mt. 11:4; Lk. 7:22.

⁵ See, e.g., Is. 35:5; 61:1.

stumbling in him.¹ Then to the multitude who were present Jesus bore witness concerning John,² from which witness it appears that he had drawn people into the "wilderness" to hear him, as the triple tradition narrates;³ also that he was the messenger of whom Malachi had spoken (Mal. 3:1),⁴ and that he was thus of more than prophetic rank; but that, notwithstanding all this greatness which belonged to him, he was, in the thought of Jesus, less than the least in the kingdom of God. Jesus left this paradox unilluminated, but they who knew of John's present condition and of his anxious question had a clue to his meaning.

Then, a little later, when characterizing the present generation, Jesus drew an illustration from John's mode of life which further helps us to form a true idea of the man. He said that John came neither eating nor drinking,⁵ that is, he lived an ascetic life, which may have seemed to him to be demanded by the nature of his preaching and by the nearness of judgment. That this mode of life was declared by some to be a proof of demonic possession⁶ suggests—what is not elsewhere intimated—that there was sharp criticism of John in certain quarters.

To this sketch of the Baptist which is contained in the *Logia* later documents, though adding some details concerning his dress and external fortunes, added nothing in regard to his character. It is only a filling out of the picture of an ascetic, marks of which we have found in the *Logia*, when it is said that John was clad in a hair garment with a leather girdle.⁷ The statements too that he had disciples and that they were in the habit of fasting⁸ are quite in accord with the *Logia*. A man such as Jesus there described would be sure to have a following, and the ascetic quality of his life would naturally be imitated.

¹ Mt. 11:5-6; Lk. 7:22-23.

² Mt. 11:7-11; Lk. 7:24-28.

³ Mk. 1:4; Mt. 3:1; Lk. 3:2.

⁴ This thought recurs in Mt. 11:14 and is hinted at in Mk. 9:11. Here belongs also the obscure word of Mt. 11:12-13; Lk. 16:16, for it represents John as the end of the old era.

⁵ Cf. Mk. 1:6; Mt. 3:4.

⁶ Matt. 11:18; Lk. 16:33.

⁷ Mk. 1:6; Mt. 3:4.

⁸ Mk. 2:18; Mt. 9:14; Lk. 5:33.

The statement in all the synoptists that John was universally regarded as a prophet (i.e., by the populace of *Jerusalem*)¹ shows unmistakably that his influence had been felt in the capital, but adds nothing to our knowledge of the man. The story of John's tragic fate, given most fully in Mark (6:14-29) and more briefly in Matthew (14:1-12), is in substance quite in accord with the *Logia*. He is there said to be in prison, here we read that he was beheaded by command of Herod Antipas.²

And finally, the scattered references, direct and indirect, to the extent and depth of John's influence say no more than is implied in the *Logia*. Mark says that all Judea and all the people of Jerusalem went forth to John's baptism (1:5), to which Matthew adds "the country about the Jordan" (3:5)—an expression that naturally includes a part of Perea. Luke's statement (3:3) that he came into all the region about the Jordan is the most moderate of all.

Quite different but perhaps equally significant is the fact that when Jesus himself was at the height of his popularity some people said that he was the Baptist come to life. Herod is reported to have spoken thus,³ and the triple tradition ascribes the same belief to a part of the community at large.⁴ But this belief, as a measure of the greatness of John, does not go beyond the word of Jesus when he declared that John was more than a prophet.

Luke has two sayings regarding John which appear to be drawn from a good source: they are at least in harmony with the outline of the *Logia*. Thus the words of John contrasting his baptism with that of his successor are introduced by a statement to the effect that all men were reasoning in their hearts whether this great preacher might not be the Christ,⁵ and again in his introduction to the Lord's Prayer he represents the disciples as saying, "Teach us to pray, as also John taught his

¹ Mk. 11:30; Mt. 21:25; Lk. 20:4.

² Josephus, *Antiq.*, 18.5.2, puts the execution in Machaerus on the north-east of the Dead Sea.

³ Mk. 6:16.

⁴ Mk. 8:28; Mt. 16:14; Lk. 9:19.

⁵ Lk. 3:15, cf. John 1:19.

disciples."¹ This latter saying, in harmony with Mk. 2:18, indicates that John organized his converts and sought to provide for their religious welfare.²

These data, if one point be excepted, present a consistent outline of John and his work. That one point is the characterization of the baptism which was to be introduced by John's successor. According to Mark this baptism was to be with the Holy Spirit, but Matthew and Luke add to this description the words "and with fire."³ There seems to be good reason for holding that Mark's language shows the influence of Christian baptism, and that the original antithesis was not "water" and "spirit," but water and "fire." Thus the preaching of John as preserved in the *Logia* points not to grace but to judgment, not to the gentle sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit, or, to speak according to Joel, not to him as the giver of visions and dreams, but to wrath, to an axe at the root of the tree, to the fan of the threshing-floor and to fire unquenchable.⁴ This symbolism is not consistent with a reference to the Holy Spirit in Mark 1:8, but suggests that the term which the Baptist used was "fire." The change to "Spirit" is natural in view of the fact that baptism by Jesus, that is, the baptism that was practiced by his followers, *proved to be a baptism with the Spirit of God*. What we see here illustrates a tendency that is often manifest in New Testament writings, viz. a tendency to let early Christian history influence the narrative of the origin of Christianity. The beginning is viewed in the light of later events.

The addition of "fire" to the description of the Messiah's baptism in Matthew and Luke may well have been made under the influence of the destruction of Jerusalem. This event, foretold by Jesus, was regarded by Paul and doubtless by many others as a judgment on the Jewish people.⁵ In any case Matthew and Luke make the bap-

¹ Lk. 11:1.

² Acts 18:25; 19:3 suggest that John's organization preserved his personal influence through a considerable period and among people who lived far from the scene of his labors.

³ Mk. 1:8; Mt. 3:11; Lk. 3:16.

⁴ Mt. 3:7, 10, 12; Lk. 3:7, 9, 17.

⁵ I Thess. 2:16.

tism which John announced for his successor a two-fold one—a baptism with fire for the impenitent and a baptism with the Spirit for the penitent.

On the basis of the data which have been presented we can form an idea of the occasion which summoned Jesus from the quiet of Nazareth. A prophet of great power had appeared in Israel. Though an ascetic, calling people forth into waste places to hear him, he was not an idle dreamer who laid the stress in his preaching on the glories of a coming age, and he was not a political reformer who like the Zealots would break off the foreign yoke and restore the scepter to Israel by violence. He called on people to turn from their sins and to live righteously. The motives which he used in making this appeal for right living carried it home with tremendous force. The kingdom of God was at hand, he declared, and only they were to enter it who could abide the day of judgment. What specific meaning John attached to the words "Kingdom of God" we cannot know. Clearly, whatever it was, that kingdom was for good men only, for those who ceased to do evil and learned to do well. The fact that John's preaching deeply stirred Israel, especially southern Palestine, is evidence that the kingdom whose nearness he announced was regarded as in some way the fulfilment of the hope of a Golden Age. It is not likely that the preacher and his audience pictured the kingdom of God to their minds in the same form and color, but to all alike it was something from God and something far better than their present lot.

With the near kingdom was associated in John's thought the one "mightier" than he, the coming one of Hebrew prophecy and hope. The only function of the coming one of which, according to our sources, John spoke to the people was that of *judge*. It is evident from the *Logia* that he had not thought of the Messiah as one who would do such works as Jesus afterward did.¹

From what specific source John had drawn the conviction that the Messiah was at hand, and that the kingdom of God was soon to be made manifest, we have no

¹ Mt. 11:2; Lk. 7:18.

means of ascertaining.¹ Probably, as in the case of the old prophets, it rested on a study of God's dealing with Israel in the past and a study of the present condition of his people.

The *Logia*—so far as that document can be reconstructed from Matthew and Luke—contained no direct allusion to the baptism of Jesus. It did, however, contain two passages which have a bearing on that event. There is first the lofty praise which Jesus bestowed on John.² If he regarded John as Elijah and his baptism as from heaven, that is at least favorable to the supposition that he himself had been baptized by John. Further, the story of the temptation of Jesus, which stood in the *Logia*, seems to imply some such experience as is described in the synoptic account of the baptism of Jesus. For the repeated statement of Satan "*If thou art the Son of God*" obviously presupposes that Jesus did so consider himself; but if he so considered himself, and if this thought was the gateway by which temptation suddenly assailed him, then it points to some recent experience by which Jesus had come to think of himself as the Son of God. Thus the *Logia*, though without a direct trace of the baptism of Jesus, is not only consistent with the synoptic account of his baptism, but in one passage actually presupposes an experience such as the synoptists associate with the baptism in the Jordan.

The triple tradition of the Jordan baptism is confined to a single verse.³ It serves merely as a vestibule by which we enter into the transcendent experience of Jesus after he had come up out of the river. This subordination is most clearly marked in Luke, for he does not even give the baptism as an independent fact but dispatches it in a participial clause.⁴

The one affirmation in which all three narratives agree is that Jesus was baptized by John. There is no sugges-

¹ Luke's story of the birth of John with its claim of relationship between his mother and the mother of Jesus is inseparable from his story of the nativity of Jesus (1:36). It may be noted here that the author of the Fourth Gospel seems not to have known of this relationship (1:33).

² Mt. 11:7-11; Lk. 7:24-28. Compare Mk. 11:30; Mt. 21:25; Lk. 20:4.

³ Mk. 1:9; Mt. 3:13; Lk. 3:21. On Mt.'s addition (3:14-15), see Part I. pp. 26-27.

⁴ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθεῖς.

tion that the act differed from John's baptism of any other person. Luke's statement that the baptism of Jesus *followed* that of all the people—that is, was the last baptism performed by John—appears to be an inference from the larger conception that the work of John as the forerunner *must* have closed with the appearance of his successor.

The brevity with which the synoptists treat the baptism of Jesus suggests that the event, at the time of its transaction, was not the subject of remark, and that no special significance had come to be attached to it in later times. Its importance was wholly eclipsed by the experience which immediately followed. But why, one may ask, did that experience follow immediately on the act of submission to John's baptism? The sequence is surely suggestive. But if the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan conditioned the coming of that experience which turned his life into an entirely new channel, it must have been important for Jesus himself. What this importance was we can only conjecture. I think of it somewhat as follows: Since Jesus came from Galilee to John at the Jordan, he must of course have *heard* of John and his message. When he reached the Jordan, he with others heard John preach. Now if in later days he thought of John's *baptism* as "from heaven" (Lk. 20:4), so at this time, as he stood by the Jordan and heard him preach, he may well have felt that his *message* also, or the burden of it at least, was from heaven. And if in later days he declared that among those born of women there had not arisen a greater than John the Baptist (Lk. 7:28), it is readily conceivable that as he, just come from the quiet life of a Nazareth carpenter, stood face to face with this mighty prophet, and heard this "Voice" announce that the kingdom of God was at hand, the spirit of longing for that kingdom and the devotion of himself to its service reached a culmination in which his whole being was absorbed and flooded with a heavenly light. Thus without transcending the bounds of the probable we have an adequate psychological ground for the experience which followed the act of baptism in the Jordan, and that act itself, commonplace to an observer, one of thousands that preceded

or followed, is seen to be a fit beginning of the public ministry of Jesus.

Of what transpired in the moments after the baptism of Jesus our sources give differing accounts. In the graphic language of Mark (1:10) Jesus saw the heavens "rent asunder," as though they were thought to be of a texture which would only yield to a strong force. Matthew and Luke substitute a quiet term, and say that the heavens "were opened" (Mt. 3:16; Lk. 3:21). Either term announces that a *vision* is to be described.¹ From the rent sky the Spirit (Mk.), or the Spirit of God (Mt.), or the Holy Spirit (Lk.), was seen by Jesus descending upon him as a dove. Luke lays stress on the unusualness of the Spirit's appearance by adding the words "in a bodily form," which make the comparison with a dove perfectly explicit.

A second independent phenomenon out of the cleft sky was a voice, which by the following utterance was shown to be the voice of God. According to Mark (1:11) and Luke (3:22) this voice said, "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased;" but according to Matthew (3:17), "*This* is my beloved Son, in *whom* I am well pleased."² Thus Matthew thought of the voice as a testimony, probably for the Baptist, concerning Jesus. Thus he either conceived of the phenomenon materially, or supposed that one or more persons besides Jesus shared in the vision.

But why did the author of the first Gospel depart in this point from the view of Mark? Probably it was under the influence of that conception of the person of Christ which is conspicuous in his writings.³ It may have appeared to him difficult to conceive how it could be needful that one who was essentially on an equality with God should be told that he was God's Son. Therefore it may have seemed necessary to him to let the voice out of heaven come to the Baptist and be a divine testimony concerning the person of Jesus. By this modification

¹ Cf. Acts 10:11; Rev. 4:1.

² The version of Matthew suggests the influence of Is. 42:1, while that of Mark and Luke suggests Psalm 2:7.

³ See Mt. 14:33; 16:18-19; 18:20; 28:18-20.

the phenomenon of the voice ceases to be of significance for Jesus. That only which concerned him was the descent of the Spirit.

It is obvious that this view of Matthew introduces a rather serious inconsistency into his own narrative, for if the Baptist received a supernatural assurance that Jesus was the beloved Son of God, how could he a few weeks later have sent to Jesus the question, "Art thou he that cometh?"¹ To have forgotten the divine voice so soon, or thus to have ignored its message, seems inexplicable in a great prophet like John.

There is yet another aspect of the question. The method of Jesus was to reveal truth, and let men draw their own inferences in regard to the revealer. He did not come forward with the bold assertion of great claims: his method was spiritual. Now it tends to discredit Matthew's version of the words spoken by the heavenly voice that they are not in accord with the method of Jesus, in which, we may certainly assume, he was guided by the Spirit of God. For a heavenly voice to declare to the Baptist that Jesus was the Son of God is foreign to the manner of Jesus in regard to himself.

But turning again to the text of the earliest Gospel as intrinsically preferable to that of Matthew, the question arises whether even this is original. One important codex (D), the old Latin translation, and a number of authorities in the Church of the East and of the West, including some of the second century, give the words of the heavenly voice according to Ps. 2:7—

"Thou art my Son,
This day have I begotten thee."

Now the early existence of two versions of what the heavenly voice said—one according to Ps. 2:7 and the other according to Is. 42:1—is unfavorable to the absolute originality of either version. It is best explained on the hypothesis that what Jesus said of his experience in that hour² was more *general* than our accounts and did

¹ Mt. 11:2-3.

² We cannot suppose that Jesus told his disciples of this vision and experience by the Jordan before the day at Caesarea Philippi.

not go beyond the assertion of a divine assurance of sonship. Subsequently this assurance found differing literary expression in different Christian circles.

What now *was* the spiritual experience of Jesus by the Jordan after he had been baptized by John? What did the descent of the Spirit mean to *him* and what the assurance that he was God's Son?

As to the descent of the Spirit upon him we have no light save that which may be derived from the Old Testament; but since the religious life of Jesus was grounded on this, we may turn to it with some confidence.

There are two passages in Second Isaiah which may reasonably be supposed to account for the vision of the Spirit's descent upon Jesus. In one of these an unknown prophet says that the Spirit of the Lord Jehovah is upon him and that he is anointed to preach good tidings to the meek (Is. 61:1-3), and in the other the Servant of Jehovah is described as the chosen of God, the one on whom the Lord has put his Spirit (Is. 42:1-4). The tone of both passages is evangelic, and with the ministry of Jesus in our mind we could readily believe that these passages had served him as a sort of ideal.

Now since in the Old Testament the prophet and the Servant of Jehovah are equipped for their ministry to Israel and to the Gentiles by the presence of the Spirit of Jehovah, when Jesus saw the Spirit coming upon him, or when he had an experience which he could *symbolically* describe in this manner, we may well believe that he felt himself in the position of the prophet of old, that he was filled with a sense of being called to minister in Jehovah's name to the captives and the broken-hearted and the mourners in Zion. The touch of a great prophet had brought him to self-realization. He too is a prophet, the chosen of Jehovah. Yea more: his experience has not yet reached its climax. To the sense of being a prophet of Jehovah is added the assurance of being his *Son*. As the vision of the Spirit leads us back to the prophetic Scriptures, so the voice and the title "Son" lead us back to the same Scriptures in their Messianic outlook. The combination of a voice out of heaven and the title

"Son" points to Ps. 2. No other passage in the Old Testament combines these two features. And no other is needed as a background for the experience in question.

Thus we have to think, or at least *may* think, that in the soul of Jesus the sense of being a prophet, clothed with the Spirit of God, was succeeded, perhaps instantly, by the yet more momentous conviction of being the *Messianic* prophet who was to bring the realization of God's promised kingdom.

The sudden recognition of this fact, the realization of this overwhelming responsibility that was laid upon him by God, found a natural expression in his immediate retirement into solitude, that in communion with God and his own soul he might learn what he had to do as the anointed Messiah of his people.

The *Logia* contained some account of the experience of Jesus in the wilderness.¹ This account appears to have consisted of three scenes, each containing a proposed course of action together with a Scripture ground for its rejection. The second and third scenes of Matthew's version are inverted in Luke. That Matthew preserves the original order is favored by the fact that his order gives a regular gradation in the inducements from the first to the third.

The essence of these three scenes is identical in the two versions, a fact that is notable in view of the unusual number of variants in the presentation of the scenes (about 40). The formal diversity is evidence of freedom in the individual handling of the *Logia* material. The general setting of these scenes points to the same freedom. Thus according to Matthew Jesus was led up into the wilderness under the impulse of the Spirit, while according to Luke he *returned* from the Jordan, full of the Spirit, and, *in* the Spirit, was led in the wilderness, that is, led about from place to place. Again, according to Matthew, the time of trial was *after* forty days, while according to Luke the trial continued all through the forty days, culminating in the three specific scenes. According to Matthew, Jesus *fasted* during the forty days

¹ Mt. 4:3-11; Lk. 4:3-13.

and nights; according to Luke, he *ate nothing*. Matthew says that Jesus went into the wilderness *for the purpose* of being tempted—a thought not found in Luke. According to Matthew, the devil left Jesus; according to Luke, he left him *for a season*. Finally, Luke has no reference to a ministry of angels.

This diversity in the setting in Matthew and Luke suggests that the account in the *Logia* was mainly *devoid of setting*. It doubtless located the trial in the "wilderness," but may not have done much more than this.

The narrative of Mark (1:12-13) gives no specific suggestion in regard to the nature of Jesus' experience in the wilderness. It shows no trace of acquaintance with the *Logia* account. Taken as a whole, it is not intelligible as a report by Jesus of his retirement into the wilderness, for we cannot suppose that he would have told his disciples that he was tempted, and yet not have said anything of the *nature* of the temptation, or how he had met it. To have done that would only have bewildered them.

Attention has been called to the freedom with which the temptation scenes are presented in Matthew and Luke while the substance is identical in the two versions. This fact indicates that the substance was in the *Logia*, a circumstance which, though not a proof of the historical character of the material, establishes a presumption in its favor. But if the story is in essence historical, it must have come ultimately from the lips of Jesus, for he was alone in the wilderness. In determining whether the story is in reality historical it is important to ask whether it agrees with the situation which it has in the life of Jesus, whether also the burden of its teaching is harmonious with what preceded and what followed. We must ask then, in the first place, what its teaching is, and in doing this we will take up the three scenes in order.

In a desert region and hungry, Jesus was confronted with the proposition, "If¹ thou art the Son of God, com-

¹ Since the tempting proposals are to be thought of as arising in the mind of Jesus, the conditional form "if thou art the Son of God" may be thought to imply momentary doubt in regard to the recent assurance of Sonship. It is not certain, however, that the conditional particle has more than a rhetorical force.

mand that these stones become bread." The title "Son of God" shows that the present experience of Jesus was in closest connection with that by the Jordan. Its meaning must be thence derived. As we have seen in the study of that experience, the title is equivalent to "Messiah." Out of this new consciousness of his mission the proposal came to Jesus to satisfy his hunger miraculously. And this—it might have been urged—would be making a natural and reasonable use of the power associated with his new office.¹

This proposal was rejected. It had assumed, and wrongly, that the present occasion justified a miraculous production of bread. It had thus ignored the truth that man is a spirit, whose life is maintained by other food than bread (Dt. 8:3).

The second proposal was in the words, "If thou art the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written:

"He shall give his angels charge concerning thee,
And on their hands they shall bear thee up,
Lest haply thou dash thy foot against a stone."

(Ps. 91:11-12).

In the setting of this scene in Matthew and Luke the height from which it was proposed that Jesus should cast himself down was a pinnacle of the temple in Jerusalem. This requires the introduction of a new element into the story, viz. the element of imagination. For we cannot suppose that Jesus *actually* left the wilderness, went up to Jerusalem, climbed to the roof of the temple, and there met the proposal to throw himself down. But if this is inconceivable, if the second proposal, like the first, confronted him *in the wilderness*, then the ascent of a pinnacle of the temple was only imaginary. But it is not at all necessary to introduce this new element, and so to weaken the force of the proposal. It is easier and more natural to suppose that the suggestion to cast himself down came to Jesus as he stood on the brink of some precipice in the wilderness which may unexpectedly have

¹ This implies of course that Jesus, at that time, shared the popular belief regarding the power of the Messiah, which we have no reason to doubt was the case.

checked him in his wanderings. In the course of time, while the tradition was yet fluid, this situation may have been exchanged for the more striking one of our text.

The proposal amounts to this: If thou art the Messiah, cast thyself down, for angels will preserve thee from harm. The desirable thing is to see whether, as Messiah, he bears a charmed life for which he does not need to be careful. That this suggestion arose, and that it had power, is evidence that Jesus shared the popular belief in regard to the miraculous resources of the Messiah.

But this proposal also was rejected. To accept it would be to tempt God, which is a forbidden thing. The man who is promised divine protection is the ordinary wayfarer who sets his love on God and dwells in his secret place (Ps. 91:1, 14), not the man who presumptuously leaps from precipices.

The third proposal, like the others, does not necessarily take us out of the "wilderness." The original situation—if we follow the suggestion of Luke's narrative—may have been some rocky point overlooking both the Jordan valley and the country to the west, with a far view also into the regions of Perea and Moab. On such a height, whether west of the Jordan or east of it does not matter, Jesus met the proposal contained in the words: "All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." There is nothing here about his being the Son of God. That title does not enter into the proposition, as in the preceding cases. But though not expressed, it is surely implied: that is to say, the proposition arose in the mind of Jesus in connection with the consciousness of the Messianic call. It is that which now filled all his thought, and only in the light of that is the proposal at all intelligible.

The devil of this third scene differs notably from the tempter of the two preceding scenes. There is a show of reason in the proposals there made, but the third proposal, *as it stands in our text*, is too gross to appeal to any being who is not morally on the same level with Satan himself. It is therefore impossible to regard this as

original. We must rather take the words "if thou wilt fall down and worship me" as giving, *from Jesus' point of view*, the real condition on which he could secure the dominion of the world. It would be, *virtually*, by worshipping Satan. This is the final thought of Jesus in regard to the popular materialistic conception of a Messianic kingdom. One could not realize that kingdom except by Satanic means.

Such are the three scenes of our text. In each one the *fulcrum* of the tempting suggestion is the consciousness of being called to the Messianic ministry. The *power* of the temptation sprang out of the popular conception of the Messiah. The rejection of each proposition came from considering it in the light of a man's supreme allegiance, from which even the Messiah is not liberated.

The question now arises whether this mental conflict and its outcome are in accord with what preceded and what followed in the life of Jesus. What preceded was the private life in Nazareth, terminated by the consecration to the kingdom of God with the accompanying experience of a new and wondrous relationship to him. That private life, out of which flowered the teaching of Jesus, must have been profoundly spiritual. If now into such a life there came the consciousness of being called to realize the Messianic kingdom—came moreover in an age when the conception of this kingdom was intensely material and political¹—a conflict would seem to be inevitable. We may suppose that Jesus in earlier years had not wholly sympathized with the prevailing Messianic views, but he then considered them from without and, as it were, at a distance; now under the pressure of the personal conviction of his own Messianic responsibility there must be realized within him an absolute harmony between his spiritual life in God and his Messianic ideal. We can understand therefore how there should have been within him a profound struggle: indeed we can hardly understand how he could have escaped such a struggle.

But let us now approach the story of the wilderness

¹ Even the apostles are represented as clinging to this conception after the resurrection of Jesus. See Acts 1:6.

experience from the other side. Here a very brief statement will be sufficient. The result of the struggle in the wilderness was the rejection of a material miraculous Messiahship. So far its significance was negative. To learn its positive significance we must go back to the vision by the Jordan.

In Jesus' consciousness that he was clothed upon with the Spirit of God, as was the Servant of Jehovah in Isaiah, there was involved the thought of a prophetic ministry, and as this consciousness was immediately enlarged or exalted to that of Messiahship, we may assume that the rejection of the popular conception of Messiahship¹ in the wilderness left in the soul of Jesus the conception of a prophetic Messiahship. But this is just the conception which we actually find both in the words of Jesus and for the most part in the Gospel narrative as well.

We conclude then that the substance of the temptation is in accord with what preceded and what followed in the life of Jesus; in other words, it seems to be an integral part of the experience of the Master.

We have now considered the critical events which terminated the private life of Jesus, and which not only foreshadowed a public career, but also indicated of what nature that career would be.

¹ According to this the Messiah was to be a political leader and his work a material kingdom.

CHAPTER IV

WHAT JESUS THOUGHT OF HIMSELF

WE have already touched the subject of this chapter in the discussion of what transpired at the baptism of Jesus and in the wilderness. We shall now take it up on the basis of all the data, beginning with the *Logia*.

A striking feature of that oldest document is the meagreness of its personal disclosures. Seven-eighths of it consists of ethical and religious instruction, without an allusion to the speaker. This instruction is similar to that of the great prophets of the earlier times, especially to that of Second Isaiah. It is marked off from that teaching by greater simplicity and spirituality, and by its wonderful blending of gentleness and authority. Taken by itself, apart from the personal element yet to be mentioned, it might be regarded merely as the culmination of Hebrew prophecy. It is therefore what the vision of Jesus by the Jordan, when he saw the Spirit descending upon him, would lead us to expect.

But while by far the greater part of the *Logia* would lead us to think of the speaker as the supreme prophet, there is a small but weighty class of passages which seem to set him apart from the prophets, and in some sense above them. But not all of these have the same claim to be regarded as part of the common source of Matthew and Luke. Let those that are doubtful be first considered.

Jesus is represented by Matthew as setting himself directly against both the traditional law and the Pentateuch.¹ This strong assertion of superiority to former authorities in Israel is not supported by Luke.² There is

¹ Mt. 5:28, 32, 34, 39, 44.

² The antithesis of Luke 6:27 is not with the *Law*, but with the thought of the verse just preceding.

also an intrinsic improbability in supposing that Jesus, who, in Mt. 5:18, had declared that while heaven and earth remain, one jot of the Law should not pass, would have voluntarily antagonized the scribes by setting his word above the sacred volume. As he most carefully sought to avoid a popular misunderstanding of his attitude toward Messiahship, even so, we may naturally think, he would not have provoked a conflict with the rulers in regard to that Law which was certainly of as great importance in their sight as was the Messianic hope. It seems probable therefore that the sharp juxtaposition of Jesus' teaching to the letter of the Law is to be ascribed to the editorial activity of the evangelist. The thought of Jesus in these verses did, indeed, go beyond, or possibly even *against*, that of the Old Testament, but we need not suppose that he expressed himself in a form that would surely be obnoxious to his hearers.

Again, it appears doubtful whether Mt. 8:21 preserves, unchanged, a saying of the *Logia*, for Luke (6:46) gives us, in the same general setting, these words: "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?" This is a protest against the present insincerity of his hearers, while the words of Mt. 7:21—"Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven"—evidently refer to the future judgment. Moreover, it is not favorable to the originality of the saying in Matthew that it involves a conception of Jesus which cannot be carried back to so early a time as that of the Sermon on the Mount. People who could possibly imagine that a reverent attitude toward Jesus would be a sufficient passport in the day of judgment must of course be supposed to have clearly recognized him as the Messiah; but such recognition, even on the part of his intimate disciples, seems not to have taken place before the great day at Caesarea Philippi, and on the part of the general public it never took place. It is obvious therefore that, as compared with the version of Luke, that of Matthew is secondary.

There is yet another passage in the double tradition of Matthew and Luke of which the two texts are so divergent

that the original saying back of them is obscured. According to Mt. 19:28 Jesus said to the Twelve: "Verily, I say unto you, that ye who have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel;" but according to Lk. 22:28-30 he said: "But ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations; and I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table, in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

Now it is noticeable, in the first place, that the settings of this passage in Matthew and Luke are unusually divergent. In Matthew it is spoken in response to a question of Peter, in Luke it is a spontaneous utterance of Jesus. Peter seems to be actuated, in Matthew, by much the same motive that led James and John to seek the first places in the coming kingdom, but in Luke Jesus, of his own accord, promises kingly rule to the Twelve in view of their faithfulness.

Still more significant are the phraseology and the ideas. Thus the word "regeneration" (*παλιγγενεσία*) occurs nowhere else in the Gospels, nor indeed in the entire New Testament in the sense it has here, for in Titus 3:5 it is individual and ethical, not cosmical.¹ Further, there is nothing in the teaching of Jesus that throws light on this term, no idea that is parallel to the meaning which it seems to have. Thus it appears in the text as a foreign element.

Again, the thought that Jesus is to sit upon a throne in the realized kingdom is found only in Matthew, and the other passage where it occurs bears marks of a late date.² Then the promise that the Twelve should be enthroned as judges of the twelve tribes of Israel seems to depart in two fundamental points from the thought of Jesus. He told James and John that it was not in his power to assign places of honor in the kingdom of God,³ and he

¹ Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 145, tells us that this word cannot be literally translated into either Hebrew or Aramaic.

² Mt. 25:31-46.

³ Mk. 10:40; Mt. 20:23.

made it clear on one notable occasion that the way of true honor was open to *all* disciples without distinction,¹ but according to the present passage he surrenders both these principles. We conclude therefore that this passage is not available with those of the *Logia* which give us light on the view which Jesus took regarding himself.²

We pass now to the more important words which Matthew and Luke derived from the *Logia*, bearing upon our subject. There is first a group of sayings that concern the attitude of men toward Jesus. Thus the Sermon on the Mount closes with the assertion that one who hears and does the words of Jesus is like a man who builds on a rock-foundation.³ The winds and floods cannot shake his structure. With this take also the word spoken of the centurion of Capernaum: "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel."⁴ From this it appears that Jesus had been looking for faith on the part of those who had heard his word and seen his works. To judge from this narrative the faith which Jesus welcomed was trust in him as able and willing to help.

There is yet another saying of the *Logia* which belongs here, that of Lk. 12:8-9; Mt. 10:32-33: "Everyone who shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of Man confess before the angels of God: but he that denieth me in the presence of men shall be denied in the presence of the angels of God." The general sense of the word "confess" is clear from the antithetic word "deny" and from the antithesis of the two scenes of confession or denial, one in the presence of men, the other before the angels of God, that is, in the day of judgment. The saying plainly assumes that a man's attitude toward Jesus is of vital importance. And that is also the implication of the two preceding passages. *Why* a man's attitude toward Jesus is of vital importance is suggested by the first of the three passages before us. It is because he reveals the character and will of God, because he is the *supreme Teacher*.

¹ Mk. 10:43-45; Mt. 20:26-28; Lk. 22:26.

² The notable peculiarities of Luke's version of this saying (e.g., the use of *πειρασμός* and *βασιλεία*) serve to confirm this conclusion.

³ Lk. 6:47-49; Mt. 7:24-27.

⁴ Lk. 7:2-10; Mt. 8:10.

A second group of sayings in the *Logia* help to define the thought of Jesus regarding himself by contrasting him with the earlier revelations of God. There is first the message of Jesus to John.¹ The messengers were to tell John what they had heard and seen in the presence of Jesus—his deeds of mercy and his preaching—and it appears that these facts were thought to be suggestive for John because of a correspondence between them and certain Messianic forecasts, as Is. 35:5 and 60:1. Then the messengers were also to bear back this most significant word: "Blessed is he whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in me." It is here plainly admitted to be *possible* that, in spite of the fact that the activity of Jesus answers in a remarkable manner to prophetic visions of the coming age, one may find in him occasion of stumbling. The one who spoke thus evidently realized that he did not *altogether* correspond to *all* the prophetic forecasts. A man *might* stand securely and intelligently on Old Testament ground and yet not recognize him as the "coming one."

Two other sayings belong here. When scribes and Pharisees sought a sign from Jesus,² he put his appearance and work in line with Jonah's appearance in Nineveh, and then went on to declare that the men of Nineveh would condemn the present generation because they had repented at Jonah's preaching, and "something greater" than Jonah was now among them. In like manner the Queen of the South would condemn the present generation, for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and "something greater" than Solomon was now among them. This "something" that is "greater"³ (πλεον) than prophets and wise men of old is not here defined, but the context clearly leads us to see it in the message of Jesus.

The second saying is that of Lk. 10:23-24; Mt. 13:16-17. "Blessed are the eyes which see the things which

¹ Mt. 11:4-6; Lk. 7:22-23.

² Lk. 11:29-32; Mt. 12:38-42.

³ It is surely significant that Jesus did not directly contrast *himself* with prophets and wise men. He did not say "one greater," but "something greater."

ye see: for I say unto you that many prophets and kings desired to see the things which ye see and saw them not, and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not." This word sets Jesus apart from the prophets, at least in the *completeness* of his message.¹

Following these two groups of passages which throw light on our subject from two points of view, we have finally a single passage which touches it in a different manner. This is the saying of Lk. 10:21-22; Mt. 11:25-27. Unfortunately the text of this great passage is not altogether certain and its original setting is unknown. As regards the text, the uncertainty belongs to the last verse. Harnack² has pointed out that the clause "and who the Son is save the Father" does not suit the context. That has to do with knowledge of the *Father*, not of the *Son*. It was knowledge of the *Father* for which Jesus gave thanks in verse 25 (Mt.), and it is knowledge of the *Father* with which the last half of verse 27 has to do.

Again, the *aim* of this verse appears to be theological, while that of the context is wholly practical. The knowledge of the Father which the *Son* has he *imparts* to others. He shares it with all who are receptive. It is the very knowledge for whose acceptance by his disciples he gave thanks in verse 25, for though his own mediation did not come into sight there it must of course be understood. But the statement that no one knows the *Son* save the Father appears to have no other aim than to claim that Jesus *can be known* by the Father only, in other words to claim that he is of the same nature with the Father, as is done by the author of Mt. 28:19. Because then this statement regarding the Father's knowledge of the Son appears to be at variance with the context, we may best regard it as a later development.

But the passage, even after this deduction, is the most comprehensive and weighty for the subject in hand which is to be found in the *Logia*. It contains the threefold claim that Jesus had a complete knowledge of the Father, that he *alone* had this knowledge, and that he could im-

¹ Cf. Lk. 10:12-15; Mt. 11:20-24.

² See *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, pp. 189-211.

part it to receptive souls. The *form* of this saying suggests the experience by the Jordan in which Jesus was conscious of being the Son of God. The completeness of the knowledge of the Father which is claimed puts the passage in the class with those already considered where Jesus contrasts God's message through him with the former revelation.

We may say that this verse sums up the content of all the passages of the *Logia* which have come into view in the present chapter. For one who was conscious of possessing a complete knowledge of the Father and conscious of being able to impart it to others could say, as Jesus did, that the man who heard and did his words was like one who builds on the rock; he could reasonably look for faith in his word and rejoice when he found it; he could say that confession or denial of him was of transcendent importance; he could say that the members of his kingdom were greater than the Baptist, though the Baptist was equal to any prophet; he could declare that something greater than Jonah and greater than Solomon had been manifested in his appearance and work, and therefore could pronounce his disciples blessed as compared with kings and prophets of old.

Thus according to those words of Jesus which are found in the *Logia*—that earliest Christian document of which we have any trace—he thought of himself as chosen to be the revealer of God. His mission was to make known the truth. He thought of himself as a prophet, but as marked off from those who had gone before by the possession of *complete* knowledge of the Father. In the vision by the Jordan, but not elsewhere in the *Logia*, is there a distinct reference to the Messianic title.

We pass now from the *Logia* to the data which are furnished by the common tradition of all the synoptists, that is, to those data of the oldest Gospel which, with or without change, were incorporated by Matthew and Luke in their narratives. How, according to these data, did Jesus regard himself?

Here, as in the *Logia*, the great body of the words ascribed to Jesus make no allusion to the speaker: the

teaching is impersonal. Naturally then, when we have only this teaching in mind, we infer that the one who gave it regarded himself as a teacher or prophet. And when we go forward to the small class of passages which do allude to the speaker, we find both these terms on his lips. Jesus placed himself in the category of prophets when he said to his unbelieving townsmen in Nazareth:¹ "A prophet is not without honor save in his own country and among his own kin and in his own house;" and he classed himself with teachers when on the last evening he sent to make preparation for the pass-over meal, and told his disciples to say to the good man of the house, "The *teacher* saith, where is my guest chamber where I shall eat the passover with my disciples?"²

To one other saying our attention is rightly called in this connection. Jesus said to a paralytic, "Thy sins are forgiven,"³ and when he saw that this word caused offense, he justified it by healing the man. But first he asked his silent critics whether it was easier to forgive sins or to heal disease. He assumed that the former was the easier, and that no one could challenge this assumption. Then he spoke the healing word to the paralytic, that his adversaries might know that he, the Son of Man, had authority to forgive sins upon earth. He seems to have regarded the announcement of forgiveness as a prophetic act, for he classed it with healing as the *easier* of the two, and acts of healing were certainly regarded by him as within the prophet's sphere.⁴ It is to be noted that Jesus did not assume to forgive sins by any right or power inherent in himself. He only claimed to be *authorized* so to act, which word clearly points away from himself to another as the original source of forgiveness.

A prophet and a teacher, then, was Jesus in his own eyes, and the great mass of his words in the triple tradition, probably nine-tenths, do not suggest any other office.

But there is here also, as in the *Logia*, a group of passages which separate, in some sense, between Jesus and

¹ Mk. 6:4.

⁴ See, e.g., Mt. 10:8.

² Mk. 14:14.

³ Mk. 2:5.

other prophets, and to these data we now turn. First in order is the famous Caesarean passage.¹ Jesus asked his disciples what men thought of him, who or what he was, and received the answer that some regarded him as John the Baptist, others as Elijah, and still others as a prophet. That is to say, the highest opinion of his mission which men held made him the *forerunner* of the Messiah. Then he put the direct question to his disciples: "But whom say ye that I am?" One voice only—that of Peter—replied: "Thou art the Christ." Yet this one voice appears to have been in reality representative, for the narrative continues that Jesus charged "them" not to speak concerning him to any one, that is, not to proclaim him as the Christ; but we cannot suppose that they would have thus proclaimed him had they not *believed* him to be the Messiah.

Jesus accepted this avowal of belief—indeed he seems to have sought it—but the belief was not to be noised abroad. It was to remain for the present a secret of friendship. It appears from what immediately followed that Jesus did not seek this avowal of faith in his Messiahship on his *own* account, but rather for the sake of his disciples themselves, that he might lead them on into a chapter of truth which he had not yet opened and for the mere hearing of which they needed the help which would come from his acknowledgment of Messiahship.

The next occasion on which Jesus is credited by the synoptists with words of unique personal import is that when, sitting on the Mount of Olives, he spoke of the destruction of the temple, and of his own future.² Two utterances are here to be considered. The first is that which affirms the imperishability of his teaching: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."³ It is most natural to take this saying in connection with Mt. 11:27 in the *Logia*. If that reflects more than a prophetic consciousness, or perhaps we should say the culmination of the prophetic consciousness, so does this.

¹ Mk. 8:27-28; Mt. 16:13-14; Lk. 9:18-19.

² Mk. 13, Mt. 24, Lk. 21.

³ Mk. 13:31.

The second word in the Olivet discourse which belongs in the group under discussion is this: "Then shall they see the Son of Man coming in the clouds with power and great glory."¹ Here we meet the title "Son of Man," not indeed for the first time in the common tradition of the synoptists,² but for the first time where its source and general sense seem to stand revealed. Not only the title itself but the "clouds of heaven" and the purpose of the coming on clouds, that is, the entire scene, is drawn from Dan. 7:13-14. The main thought of that passage in Daniel is plain: the being who receives the final and everlasting kingdom is the representative of perfected humanity; he comes not from beneath, as the "beasts" (7:3) that symbolize the worldly and ungodly, but from above, with the clouds of heaven. This picture is Messianic in the sense that it has the note of finality, of consummation.

We turn from the Olivet discourse to a word which Jesus spoke on the last evening of his life, while he was with the Twelve in the upper room and while his thought was upon the treachery of Judas: "The Son of Man goeth *even as it is written of him*, but woe unto that man through whom the Son of Man is betrayed."³ But it is nowhere written in the Old Testament that one called the "Son of Man" goes to death.⁴ Therefore, if Jesus used this title, it seems that he must have used it as a synonym of "Messiah." There are in the Old Testament certain forecasts of the *Messiah's* suffering, and we have already seen that both in the *Logia* and in the common tradition of the synoptists there are words of Jesus which clearly point to a Messianic claim. It seems therefore that in this instance Jesus used the title "Son of Man" in a general Messianic sense.

We come now to the last passage of the present group. At the trial of Jesus, first by the sanhedrin and then by Pontius Pilate, the synoptists represent him as having

¹ Mk. 13:26; Mt. 24:30; Lk. 21:27.

² See Mk. 2:15, 10, 28; Mt. 9:6; 12:8; Lk. 5:24; 6:5.

³ Lk. 22:22 has *κατὰ τὸ ὀρισμένον* instead of a reference to the Scriptures. This more philosophical form, akin to Greek thought rather than to the Hebrew, cannot stand as against that of Mk. 14:21 and Mt. 26:24.

⁴ Cf. Mk. 9:13.

answered affirmatively the question of Caiaphas, "Art thou the Christ?"¹ and the question of Pilate, "Art thou the king of the Jews?"² These two scenes form a contrast to that at Caesarea Philippi in this sense that, while Jesus there tacitly accepted the disciples' avowal of belief in his Messiahship, he here, in the presence of his enemies and in the most solemn manner, affirms his Messiahship. He knew that to make this claim before the high priest would cost him his life. We have no right to say that the *conviction* of his Messianic call was any clearer in the day of his trial than it was at Caesarea Philippi: we say only that the *expression* of it was the most solemn that he ever made.

The data which we have now considered are all that the triple tradition contains which imply that Jesus thought of himself as more than a prophet. His works of healing fall within the prophetic office. Such works had been done by men of God in former times, and such were done by the disciples of Jesus. What such works were thought to show was the presence of God with the one who wrought them,³ or, otherwise expressed, they authenticated one as a prophet.⁴

There is one passage in the common tradition of the synoptists in which Jesus speaks of God as his Father,⁵ and only one. But it is not clear that this has any peculiar bearing whatever on the individual relation of Jesus to God. For, according to the *Logia*, Jesus taught his disciples to address God as Father,⁶ nor is there any suggestion in that document, or in the common synoptic tradition, that in his thought the fatherhood of God was one thing for them and something essentially different for him.

In conclusion on this part of our sources it may be said that in the common synoptic tradition as in the *Logia*

¹ Mk. 14:61; Mt. 26:63; Lk. 22:67, 70. The terms "Son of Man" and "Messiah" are here used without difference of meaning. Luke's divergent text cannot be regarded as in any point superior to that of Mark and Matthew.

² Mk. 15:2; Mt. 27:11; Lk. 23:3.

³ See Acts 7:9.

⁴ Lk. 7:16; Mk. 6:15; 8:28.

⁵ Mk. 8:38; Mt. 16:27; Lk. 9:26.

⁶ Mt. 5:48; Lk. 6:36.

Jesus thinks of himself as a prophet and thinks of himself also as the Messiah. This latter thought is more explicit here than in the *Logia*, but we cannot say that it is more developed. The tone of finality in Mt. 11:27, or in the manner in which Jesus contrasted himself with the former revelation of God, carries in it all the Messianic meaning which is contained in Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, or in the solemn affirmation before the sanhedrin.

From the triple tradition we pass now to those data which are found in one or two of the synoptic narratives but not in all.

In Mark and Matthew¹ Jesus said, speaking of a certain future hour, that neither the angels in heaven nor the *Son* knew of it; only the Father knew. But this term "Son" and the juxtaposition of Son and Father do not take us beyond that spiritual experience of Jesus by the Jordan the expression of which was suggested by Ps. 2. The verse belongs with those already considered which reflect a Messianic consciousness. It is of interest to note that here where *knowledge* is concerned the Son is placed above the angels. The word is of kin with Mt. 11:27, and breathes the consciousness of an unique office. Parallel to this thought is the teaching of Lk. 10:38-42. He who was confident that he knew the Father as no other had known him could say that to sit at his feet and hear his word, as Mary did, was the one thing needful. And finally, it is in accord with the *Logia* and with the triple tradition when, according to Luke 13:33, Jesus classed himself with the prophets, saying, "It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem," and when, according to Matthew 28:8, he spoke of himself as a teacher.

All that has been said thus far in the present chapter has concerned the historical mission of Jesus. But this unique *mission* in which Jesus felt himself to be the fulfilment of the highest aspirations of his people—did it, in his own thought, imply any essential difference between him and his fellowmen?

In the first place, it is to be said that, so far as our

¹ Mk. 13:32; Mt. 24:36.

oldest sources are concerned, there is not the slightest indication that Jesus ever considered this question. There is no indication that he ever said a word on the *conditions* of Messiahship—why *he* was chosen for this mission rather than any one else, whether it was because of inner purity, or because his *being* was different from that of other men. His followers have indulged in much speculation along this line, and speculations have hardened into dogmas, but Jesus was silent. There is evidence that he thought much of the will of God and of conforming his will to the Father's, but none whatever that he discussed with himself the question whether his *being* was like or unlike that of the men around him.

A more difficult question is whether Jesus thought of himself as wholly different from other men in *character*. The *Logia*, if we except the story of the temptation, has nothing that bears directly on this point. If Jesus had there presented himself as the *judge* of men, that would have required investigation to determine whether the function of universal judge implied perfect character, but it is doubtful whether he did so speak of himself. For Mt. 7:23 is not supported by Lk. 13:25-27. In the former passage words of judgment are ascribed to Jesus; but in the parallel, Jesus speaks in a parable of the relation of a lord and his steward. The point of the passage moreover is the call to faithfulness, not the decision of the question who is to judge the faithful and the unfaithful. And again, in Mt. 10:32-33; Lk. 12:8-9, Jesus speaks of confessing or denying certain men in the presence of God, which language appears to give him the function of a *witness* and to ascribe judgment to God. It may be noted at once that this uncertainty of the *Logia* is found also in various passages of Matthew and Luke which were not in the *Logia*. Thus in Mt. 6:5 and 18:35 it is *God* who either forgives, or judges and executes, and in those parables of Matthew which associate the Son of Man with judgment,¹ the real testing and execution are left to *angels*. In Lk. 18:8 the avenger of the elect is God.

¹ Mt. 13:41, 49.

We have then in the *Logia* simply the story of the temptation that bears on the point in hand. With this may be associated one word in the common synoptic tradition.¹ To the rich man who addressed Jesus as "Good Teacher" the reply was made, "Why callest thou me good? none is good save one, God." It is obvious that the primary purpose of Jesus here is to direct the man's thought to God as the one perfect standard of right. Incidental to this is his refusal to accept for himself the title "good." But though incidental, this word appears to be significant for our thought of Jesus. If we define its significance in harmony with the story of the temptation in the wilderness, we shall say that it implies a sense of human weakness and liability to sin. It does not imply a *consciousness* of sin, but it is not intelligible unless behind it lay a consciousness of being *temptable*. This consciousness would be ample reason for rejecting the unqualified epithet of "good." In accord with the recognition that he was temptable is the well established fact that Jesus prayed.

Further than this our sources do not directly justify us in going. To believe that Jesus was the purest and best of mankind is required both by the story of his life and by his influence on the world; but that he regarded himself as wholly sinless we are not justified in affirming on the ground of his own words and deeds. That in such crises as the temptation in the wilderness and the night in Gethsemane he was conscious of utmost loyalty to God's will is indeed strong evidence that in the interval between these two scenes, in circumstances of less terrible aspect, his inner allegiance was unmarred. And the idea of this spiritual integrity, preserved by struggle and prayer, is not inconsistent with the refusal to be called good. For the sense that there was *need* of struggle and *need* of prayer would not allow him to think of his goodness as on the same level with the unchangeable goodness of God. Even though he had never been overcome, he felt that he might be.

We are now at the end of what the historical sources

¹ Mk. 10:17-22; Mt. 19:16-22; Lk. 18:18-23.

have to teach on the question how Jesus regarded himself. We shall conclude with a survey of the ground which has been covered.

In the *Logia*, in the common tradition of the synoptists, and in other words ascribed to Jesus by only one or two of the Gospels, there is extremely little reference to himself. The bulk of the teaching is impersonal, and from its character we infer that the speaker was a prophet, was the greatest of the prophets. But in all these sources there are also some personal assertions or allusions. From these we learn that Jesus explicitly classed himself with the prophets and spoke of himself as a teacher. We learn also, both from the *Logia* and from the oldest Gospel, that he believed himself to be the Messiah. This belief was not privately avowed until the day at Caesarea Philippi, and not avowed in public until the day of his death, and even then not spontaneously. Jesus never defined his Messiahship. The withholding of the claim to be Messiah is sufficient evidence, and *was* at the time sufficient evidence, that he did *not* share the popular view. On the other hand, the simple fact that his life was given to teaching, of which his deeds furnished visible illustration, makes it plain that, in his own mind, the ministry of the Messiah was the culmination of prophetic ministry.

As to the *nature* of Jesus, whether it was different from that of other men, there is no evidence in our sources that this was ever the subject of remark or of reflection on his part.

That, in the sphere of *character*, Jesus made an *absolute* separation between himself and others we are not warranted by his words and acts in affirming. He made it clear that he was acquainted with temptation and conscious of needing God's help. But a sense of creaturely *dependence* is by no means inconsistent with a consciousness of *perfect* moral integrity, and such a consciousness, it seems to us, can hardly be separated from the unclouded conviction of Jesus that he knew the Father as no one had ever known him and that he could impart this saving knowledge to others.

CHAPTER V

THE IDEAL OF JESUS FOR HIS PEOPLE

WE have seen that Jesus thought of himself as a prophet and as the Messiah of his people, as the one chosen to complete the revelation of God which had been imperfectly made known in former times. To this truth the present question is nearly related. As the final prophet of his people, what was his ideal for them?

In seeking to answer this question we begin with the oldest source, the *Logia*. This document, miscellaneous in character, contains no formal statement of the thought of Jesus on any subject. It does not announce his ideal. It contains three or four score of sayings which profoundly touch many sides of man's life, but it sets no one particular truth in the center. It must therefore be regarded with great care if we are to derive from it any clear and satisfactory light on the ideal of Jesus for his people.

There are two ways of approaching Jesus' ideal as far as it is reflected in the *Logia*. One is to take the various spiritual utterances, like the beatitude for those who hunger and thirst after righteousness, analyze these utterances, and classify their content. This may have been the way that a thoughtful hearer actually proceeded for a time. Such an one heard new and beautiful truths from the lips of Jesus, compared them, more or less consciously, with similar utterances of the Old Testament, and laid them up in memory as so many separate teachings on this subject and on that. The other and better way to the goal is to start from those sayings which are personal in character and which cannot be separated from the speaker. Of these there are several that bear on the present subject.

The first is given by Matthew in the address to the

disciples when they were sent out to teach and to heal:¹ "A disciple is not above his master, nor a servant above his lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord."² It is implied in these words that the disciple of Jesus *can* become like him, and that to be like him is the goal of discipleship. The application of this principle that follows, viz. that the disciple is to expect hardship and suffering since that has been the lot of the Master, is not to be regarded as giving its entire scope. It is simply one particular, of immediate practical importance, which illustrates the principle.

The second saying of this group is given by Matthew in the same address,³ though Luke puts it much later when the consequences of following Jesus were more to be feared than at the time of the mission of the Twelve.⁴ The saying turns on the thought of confessing Jesus, or denying him, before men. This is represented as of fundamental importance, for it is implied that it determines one's acceptance or rejection by God. Yet the character of the confession or denial is not indicated. Elsewhere in this address and in other teaching of Jesus we learn what is meant. He that doeth the will of the Father, he that builds on the words of Jesus, he that is *as* his Master—he it is who *confesses* him.⁵ Thus it is seen to be a matter of the life, not of the lips.

The third saying is that of Mt. 11:25-27; Lk. 10:21-22. Jesus thanked the Father that he had revealed truth to his disciples, but it is quite manifest that he thought of the Father's revelation as made *through* him. He is the one who knows the Father and who can reveal him to others.

These three sayings from the *Logia* help us to understand the ideal which Jesus had for his people. The disciple is to know the Father through Jesus; he is to make a living confession of Jesus; he is to be like Jesus. Hence Jesus could say, "He that receives you receives

¹ This location of the saying as well as Matthew's version of it is preferable to Luke's (6:40).

² Mt. 10:24-25.

³ Mt. 10:32-33.

⁴ Lk. 12:8-9.

⁵ Mt. 7:21, 24; 10:25.

me, and he that receives me receives him that sent me."¹ The disciple is to have *his* spirit as *he* has the Father's spirit, that is to say, he is to have the spirit of the Father through him.

Stated then in the simplest terms, the ideal of Jesus for his people, as we find it in the *Logia*, was that *they should be like him*. It was a personal ideal. It was grounded wholly, so far as we can see, in Jesus' own spiritual experience. It was not theoretical, but absolutely vital.

Since therefore the ideal of Jesus for his people arose out of his own inner experience as a flower comes forth out of the hidden roots of the plant, we are justified in returning to the impersonal sayings of the *Logia* with the presumption that they had a personal background, and were born out of the real experience of a living man. There are some sayings in the *Logia* that obviously cannot be brought under this head—sayings in regard to the past and the future, and sayings that interpret points of the Law or touch great principles of right and justice. Thus, when Jesus said that one jot should not pass from the Law until all was fulfilled,² that many should come from the east and the west, and should sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven,³ and that it should be more tolerable for Sodom in the day of judgment than for certain Galilean cities,⁴ and other similar words, it is evident that his thought was moving beyond the range of personal experience. But in the much larger class of passages of moral and spiritual import, which constituted the bulk of the *Logia*, we are doubtless justified in seeing an expression of what he had learned and felt in his own soul. The beatitudes on the poor and the mourners, and on those who hunger and thirst after righteousness;⁵ the injunctions not to resist him who is evil,⁶ to love one's enemies,⁷ to refrain from judging,⁸ to practice unlimited forgiveness,⁹ and to do to

¹ Mt. 10:40; Lk. 10:16.

² Mt. 5:18; Lk. 16:17.

³ Mt. 8:11-12; Lk. 13:28, 29.

⁴ Mt. 10:15; Lk. 10:12.

⁵ Mt. 5:3, 4, 6; Lk. 6:20-21.

⁶ Mt. 5:39-40; Lk. 6:27-30.

⁷ Mt. 5:44-48; Lk. 6:32-36.

⁸ Mt. 7:1-2; Lk. 6:37-38.

⁹ Mt. 18:21-22; Lk. 17:4.

others what one would desire from them;¹ the exhortation regarding anxiety,² the appeal to trust God's constant and minute care,³ all words on the power of faith⁴ and the absolute value of reality in religion⁵—these and other fundamental teachings on the individual and social life we have reason to believe were born out of Jesus' own deep experience. This is the great ground, we may well believe, why people felt a tone of *authority* in his teaching.⁶ He spoke not by rote but out of the heart.

Another passage of very peculiar value remains to be noted in this connection, and that is the Lord's Prayer.⁷ If we approach this from the side of those great utterances of the *Logia* which present the ideal of Jesus for his people as the reflex of his own inner life, and remember the stress which he laid on reality, we shall regard it as drawn from his own experience—as the sort of prayer that he himself had prayed, it may be for many years. The petition for the forgiveness of sins may be an exception—certainly *is* an exception—unless we hold, as perhaps we should, that Jesus with his unique sense of the holiness of God may have accounted as sin even such a momentary entertainment of wrong thoughts as vexed his soul in the wilderness and the conscious need of *effort* to obtain a perfect acquiescence in the Divine will, as in the hour in Gethsemane.

It appears then that so far as the ideal of Jesus for his people can be learned from the *Logia* it was a purely *religious* ideal, born of his own experience. It was related indeed to the domestic, social, political and national life, but it was *not* an ideal for any one of these spheres. It was rather the essential *condition* of right ideals for all of them—for the home and society and the state.

We have thus far taken no account of one term that is used in the *Logia*, though it is a term which has often served as the starting-point in discussions of the ideal of

¹ Mt. 7:12; Lk. 6:31.

² Mt. 6:25-33; Lk. 12:22-31.

³ Mt. 7:7-11; 10:29-30; Lk. 10:9-13; 12:6-8.

⁴ E.g., Mt. 17:20; Lk. 17:6.

⁵ Mt. 7:21, 24-27; Lk. 6:46, 47-9.

⁶ E.g., Mk. 1:22, 27.

⁷ Mt. 6:9-13; Lk. 11:2-4.

Jesus, or even as synonymous with that ideal, viz. the term "kingdom of God." But this subordination, so far at least as the *Logia* is concerned, is in accordance with the data. Let these now be brought forward. Take first the passages in which the sense of the term is plain. When Jesus declared that many should come from the east and the west and should sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, but that the sons of the kingdom should be cast forth into the outer darkness,¹ the term is a simple equivalent of "heaven." With this use of the term we have here no further concern.

Again, there are two passages in the *Logia* where the term has a present significance which is not doubtful. These are the petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Thy kingdom come,"² and the exhortation, "Seek ye his kingdom."³ Matthew's amplification of the petition with the words "Thy will be done" *explains* the petition. This we are warranted in saying by passages in the same source which represent man's supreme duty as the doing of God's will which Jesus had made known.⁴ In like manner Matthew's amplification of the other saying suggests its meaning. Where Luke says "Seek ye his kingdom," Matthew has "Seek ye his kingdom and *his righteousness*." One who seeks and finds God's *righteousness*, finds his kingdom. Thus in both these sayings of the *Logia* the "kingdom of God" is the rule of God in man's heart. When his will is done, his kingdom has come.

With these passages may be classed that which likens the kingdom to leaven,⁵ and probably also that beatitude which promises the kingdom to the poor.⁶

In the two passages that remain to be noted, the term "kingdom" may still be taken in the sense of rule—God's rule in man's heart—but the context suggests in each case that this rule has a unique realization in and through Jesus. It is the consciousness of this truth that finds expression in the words of Jesus to the Twelve when he

¹ Mt. 8:11-12; Lk. 13:28-29.

² Mt. 6:10; Lk. 11:2.

³ Mt. 6:33; Lk. 12:31.

⁴ Mt. 7:24-27; 11:25-27; Lk. 6:47-49; 10:21-22.

⁵ Mt. 13:33; Lk. 13:20-21.

⁶ Mt. 5:3; Lk. 6:20.

declared that the kingdom was *at hand*, or had come nigh,¹ and also in that saying wherein he contrasted his disciples with the Baptist—"he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he."² It is impossible to suppose that he compared his disciples with John in the simple matter of conformity to God's will. John was surely in the kingdom of God in the sense that he was obedient to God's will as made known to him in Law and Prophets; but he did not belong to the New Era in which God's will was uniquely made known in Jesus. Thus in both these passages the term "kingdom of God" acquires a new meaning through its association with Jesus. It still denotes God's rule in the heart, but God's rule as historically realized.

Thus it is seen that Jesus' use of the term "kingdom of God" confirms what had previously been said about his ideal for Israel.

We pass now from the *Logia* to the common tradition of the synoptists. What light does this throw on the ideal of Jesus for his people? It is to be remarked, in the first place, that here, even as in the *Logia*, those words of Jesus in which his thought for his people is most pronounced and comprehensive present that thought or ideal in a *personal* form. Thus he said to his disciples and to the multitude that he required men to follow him at all hazards,³ and that nothing should be allowed to make them ashamed of him or of his words.⁴ The rich ruler who had kept the commandments of the Law he summoned *to follow him*.⁵ Another scene that presents his thought even more completely is that in which his mother and brothers sought to have him come forth to them from the house where he was teaching.⁶ Looking about on those who sat around him he said, "Behold my mother and my brothers! For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother and sister and mother." Surely they who had come into the near relationship to him of brother and sister and mother were actually realizing his

¹ Mt. 10:7; Lk. 10:9.

² Mt. 11:11; Lk. 7:28.

³ Mk. 8:34; Mt. 16:24; Lk. 9:23.

⁴ Mk. 8:38; Mt. 16:27; Lk. 9:26.

⁵ Mk. 10:21; Mt. 19:21; Lk. 18:22.

⁶ Mk. 3:34; Mt. 12:49; Lk. 8:21.

ideal for his people. And that ideal bound them to him as it bound them to God. It was personal, and it was religious. To hear him receptively was to do the will of God. There is no scene in the triple tradition that is more impressive and illuminating than this. There is no uncertainty in the words of Jesus or in the situation in which they were spoken. All is clear and explicit.

It seems fitting to place by the side of this scene that other equally characteristic one where Jesus took little children in his arms and said, "To such belongeth the kingdom of God."¹ The kingdom is something that can be received and possessed, but only as a little child receives, that is, humbly and with a trustful heart. Now the people seated around Jesus in the former scene were receiving his word in such a spirit that he referred to them as doing God's will. A comparison of the two scenes suggests that, in the passage about the children, Jesus meant by "kingdom" just the Father's rule in the heart and nothing else.²

But we have not yet exhausted the data in the common synoptic tradition which present the ideal of Jesus for his people in a personal form. Conspicuous among these data is the declaration that the Son of Man came to minister.³ This is given as the ground of his appeal to the Twelve to regard the way of service as the way to true greatness. Twice, according to the common synoptic tradition, he emphasized this principle. Once was in Capernaum, after the question of their individual greatness had been discussed by the Twelve on the way thither,⁴ and the other time, just referred to, was when, on the way to Jerusalem, James and John sought assurance from the Master that they should have the first places in his kingdom. Here he bases his appeal upon his own example. The principle of service is to be fundamental in their lives because it has been fundamental in the life of the Son of Man. This is not the whole of his ideal for his people, but it is an essential

¹ Mk. 10:14; Mt. 19:14; Lk. 18:16.

² Cf. Mk. 4:11, 30; 10:23 with the parallels in Mt. and Lk.

³ Mk. 10:45; Mt. 20:28; Lk. 22:27.

⁴ Mk. 9:33-34; Mt. 18:1; Lk. 9:46.

part of it, and it is purely personal. It was the very culmination of this thought when, on the last evening, Jesus gave his disciples bread and wine as symbols of his body and blood. The gift of these implied that he was about to give the supreme illustration of willing devotion to the principle of service. The supper was the consecration of his ideal on its social side. By partaking of the bread and wine they were solemnly pledged to him in his capacity of a ministering friend.

We may note, in passing, what the ideal of Jesus for his people implied in relation to the Old Dispensation. The data on this point are incidental and doubtless fragmentary. We are not to suppose that they are a formal and complete statement of the thought of Jesus on the relation of his ideal to the Old Covenant. But though incidental, they are important.

When the disciples of Jesus were criticized because they did not fast, as did the Pharisees and the disciples of John, Jesus defended them on the ground that the present was a time for joy.¹ Therefore to require fasting of his disciples would be as unfit and injurious as to use unfulled cloth in patching an old garment, or to put new wine into old wine skins.² The fasting in question was doubtless *not* that which the Law required on the great day of atonement,³ but some traditional institution. This fact, however, does not affect the principle. The word of Jesus excludes *all* fasting, for fasting was to express sorrow of heart, but his disciples were glad. Nor was this gladness to be temporary, for it was due to him and his teaching. True, he was not to remain with them in person, but his teaching could not be torn from their souls, and through that teaching they would always, in a sense, have him.

That Jesus expected the ground-tone of the life of his disciples to be one of gladness and not sorrow is implied in the saying of the common tradition that they who followed him should receive in the present an

¹ Mk. 2:18-19; Mt. 9:15; Lk. 5:34.

² Mk. 2:21-22; Mt. 9:16-17; Lk. 5:36-38.

³ Lev. 16:29.

hundred fold for all that they must relinquish, and, in the future, eternal life.¹ This promise, as regards the present, may well have sprung out of his own experience. *He* had left house and brothers and sisters and mother for the sake of the kingdom of God, and had he not received an hundred fold? What could be compared to the joy of seeing his disciples come into the possession of his own trust in God? What would have been to him an equivalent in houses and lands of the joy of hearing the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi? What could the present offer that would so fill his heart with thanksgiving as the evidence he had that the Father had revealed a knowledge of his kingdom to the disciples? If then his disciples followed him, if they confessed him in their lives—to use the figure of the *Logia*—he could assure them, on the ground of his own experience, that they would receive an hundred fold for all that this course required them to give up. Jesus felt that with his work a New Era had begun,² and that one mark of this New Era was gladness.

We have now examined the *Logia* and the common tradition of the synoptists to learn what ideal Jesus had for his people. We have yet to consider certain material which is peculiar to Matthew or to Luke, but which is historically accredited.

The single tradition of Matthew has nothing to put by the side of what the *Logia* and the common synoptic tradition give us in regard to Jesus' ideal for his people. It has suggestive details, but no clear commanding utterance on the subject.³ What it has, however, falls into line with the teaching of the sources which have been examined.

In the address concerning scribes and Pharisees Matthew has these two sayings: "Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your teacher, and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father on the earth, for one is your Father, which is in heaven."⁴ The bearing of these words on

¹ Mk. 10:30; Mt. 19:29; Lk. 18:30.

² Mt. 11:13; Lk. 16:16.

³ On Mt. 11:28-30, see pp. 144-145, note.

⁴ Mt. 23:8.

the present subject is that they assert the supremacy of the teachership of Jesus,¹ a consciousness of his mission which we have found already in the *Logia*. And here, as in that document, the fatherhood of God stands in close connection with the teachership of Jesus. It is not indeed directly suggested that the subject of his teaching is the character of God, and in this respect the passage is not so important as Mt. 11:27, but it is parallel to the *Logia* and the triple tradition in its general suggestion that the ideal of Jesus for his people was something which they were to acquire through personal contact with him.

As to the "kingdom of God," the single tradition of Matthew brings us two parables—The Hid Treasure and The Goodly Pearl²—which represent that kingdom as the highest good and which are therefore in intimate accord with those passages in the *Logia* and the common synoptic tradition in which the kingdom of God is thought of as God's rule in man. There can be no doubt that Jesus regarded this identification of man's will with God as indeed the highest good.

But Matthew has two other passages—The Tares in the Wheat and the Drag-net³—which also have an indirect bearing on the ideal of Jesus for his people. According to the *Logia*, the Baptist announced a radical separation of society at the Messiah's advent;⁴ but in these passages Jesus presents a different view of his mission. His kingdom is not to be like a field of wheat unmixed with any weeds, or a net that contains only good fish. Therefore his ideal for his people does not contemplate a new sort of external environment: the old environment, which is both bad and good, is to remain.

The single tradition of Luke has two passages which are of the first importance for the question now before us, as well as several which only duplicate the thought of those which we have found in the *Logia* and the common synoptic tradition. To note the latter group first. In a sermon which Luke puts in the synagogue at Nazareth⁵

¹ Implied also in Mt. 5:17.

³ Mt. 13:24-30, 47-50.

² Mt. 13:44-46.

⁴ Mt. 3:12; Lk. 3:17.

⁵ The oldest Gospel, followed by Matthew, puts the beginning of the ministry of Jesus in Capernaum. Mk. 1:21; Mt. 4:12-13.

Jesus took as his text the opening paragraph of Is. 61. This is the passage that seems to have determined the form of the vision which Jesus had by the Jordan, and to this passage he may also have referred in his reply to the message of the Baptist, as reported in the *Logia*. The use of the passage by Jesus throws light on his ideal for his people no less than on his thought of himself. He said that the prophet's word was fulfilled in their ears. Accordingly, the release of captives here mentioned, the recovering of sight to the blind, and the liberation of the bruised, are to be understood, primarily, in a spiritual sense. If this be correct, then the suggestion of the passage is that Jesus' great desire for his people was to have them come into a state of freedom and vision in their relation to God. A second word in this group is the beatitude on those who hear the word of God and keep it.¹ This is obviously parallel to that scene in the common synoptic tradition where Jesus owned as his true relatives those who did the will of God. And finally, Luke's word on counting the cost of discipleship beforehand² is in line with the *Logia* and with the common synoptic tradition. Its suggestion regarding the ideal of Jesus is indirect, viz. that this ideal is associated with Jesus himself and that its attainment calls for whole-hearted devotion to him.

We turn now to the two more significant texts in Luke's peculiar material. One is the inimitable story of what took place in the home of Mary and Martha.³ This has all the originality and clearness of that other scene when Jesus sat among receptive listeners. Mary reclined at his feet and received his word. Martha took thought for many things to set before her guests. Jesus, gently rebuking her, said that but few things were needful, or even one. It is obvious from the next words that this clause "even one" has a double meaning. One course only was needful for their supper, one thing only was needful for their higher life, and that one thing Mary had chosen. It was to learn the will of God

¹ Lk. 11:27-28.

² Lk. 14:28-33.

³ Lk. 10:38-42. John (11:1) puts this home in Bethany near Jerusalem.

through Jesus. This we may safely supply from the united evidence of the *Logia* and the common synoptic tradition. The great word of Lk. 10:22 would alone warrant us in assuming that what Jesus had been saying in the home of the two sisters was about the heavenly Father and the religious life.

The other word of the Lucan tradition which bears on our subject is that which was addressed to certain Pharisees who had asked when the kingdom of God was to come. Jesus said: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, There! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you."¹ Whether we translate "within you" or "in the midst of you" we come at last to the same result; the kingdom of God is inner and spiritual. If it was at that moment in the midst of the auditors of Jesus, it was there because it was in his soul and planted in the souls of his disciples. If then we describe the ideal of Jesus for his people by the term "kingdom of God," we say nothing different from the teaching of those passages which describe it as doing the will of God or confessing Jesus, as learning of the Father through him and living as he lived.

It remains to sum up briefly the results reached in the examination of the various sources. It is very significant that not only the *Logia* and the common synoptic tradition but also the other sources from which Matthew and Luke drew, all witness to the same general ideal of Jesus for his people. That ideal is, first of all, an ideal for the inner life. It is religious: it concerns a man's relation to God and his relation to his fellowmen. If we designate these two relationships as religious and moral, it must be remembered that, in the thought of Jesus, the spirit and the motive in both are the same. Again, the ideal of Jesus is not only an ideal for the entire inner life; it is also an ideal realized in him and to be realized through him. It is inseparable from him. The relation to him of those who may hope to realize his ideal is one of life and death. On this aspect of the ideal the utmost

¹ Lk. 17:20-21.

emphasis is laid. And finally, the ideal of Jesus sprang out of his knowledge of God—his character and will—and there is no reason to think that this knowledge was attained otherwise than by the way of personal experience.

It is obvious that this ideal was widely unlike the popular dream of a Messianic kingdom. The most that they had in common was that both looked toward a better state in Israel. But one was prevailingly outward, political, national; the other prevailingly inner, spiritual, and therefore essentially universal in its scope. The one was to be realized from without, the other from within.

Whether Jesus, at any time, thought that this spiritual ideal would work itself out in a new and glorious Jewish state, there is no evidence to determine in an absolute manner. The *Logia* speaks of the "day of the Son of Man," which is associated with judgment,¹ but it never says what lies beyond it; and its clearest references to judgment do not allude to the day of the Son of Man, and they look entirely away from the earth.² In the common tradition of the synoptists also there are two references to a coming of the Son of Man,³ but the only thought associated with this is the thought of judgment.

We do not need to pursue this inquiry further at present. The ideal of Jesus for his people is clearly deducible from his words, and we should not obscure it by association with questions that certainly were not prominent in his thought. His great concern for men was immediate and practical; he had little to say of the details of any future state of his people, whether here or hereafter.

The ideal of Jesus for his people was, in regard to spirituality, in line with Is. 61:1-3, but both in its personal association with himself and in its claim to knowledge of God it transcended all prophetic foreshadowings. The tone of authority and finality in the words of Jesus sprang out of the conviction that he had come to know God as no one else had known him. *What* it was in God that

¹ Mt. 24:27, 37-39, 40-41, 43-51; Lk. 17:24, 26-27, 34-35; 12:42-46.

² Mt. 6:20-21; 8:11-12; 10:32-33; Lk. 12:33; 13:28-29; 12:8-9.

³ Mk. 8:38; 13:26; Mt. 16:27; 24:30; Lk. 9:26; 21:27.

he had seen as no one else before him had seen can be expressed in the single word "fatherhood." This truth is stamped deeply on the *Logia*¹ and on Luke's peculiar material.² We may say that Jesus' ideal for his people flowered out of the fatherhood of God, as that had been apprehended by him in his own spiritual life.

¹ Mt. 5:44-48; 6:9, 26, 32; 7:11; 11:25-27; Lk. 6:22, 36; 11:2; 12:24, 30; 11:13; 10:21-22.

² E.g., Lk. 15.

CHAPTER VI

THE RESOURCES AND THE METHOD OF JESUS

WITH what equipment and in what ways did Jesus seek to realize his ideal for the people round about him? In endeavoring to answer this question our first duty is to examine the *Logia*. We are here confronted by a number of facts which bear on the resources of Jesus.

Doubtless the most characteristic feature of the *Logia*—and we may believe that it was most characteristic of the preaching of Jesus—is its disclosure of God, more particularly of his limitless goodness. It was a sense of this goodness which made the first word of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount “Blessed,” and promised the kingdom of God to the poor, comfort to mourners, and satisfaction to those who hunger and thirst after righteousness.¹ The fact of this goodness, manifested alike to the evil and the good in the commonest mercies of life, was the basis of the plea of Jesus that men should rise to a life of unselfish love.² This divine goodness determined every clause of the prayer which Jesus gave his disciples as a pattern for their prayers.³ It inspires the confidence that says “Father;” it makes it forever natural for the best of men to utter, first of all, the petitions, “Thy kingdom come, thy will be done;” it is this which justifies every child of earth in asking for the forgiveness of sins with the same absolute trust that he has in asking for daily bread; and it is this also—this fact of the fatherly goodness of God—that makes the language of ideal prayer simple and quiet. Again, it was in view of the loving thoughtfulness of God that Jesus sought to lift men above anxiety for the material necessities of life into

¹ Mt. 5:3, 4, 6.

² Mt. 5:44-48.

³ Mt. 6:9-13; Lk. 11:2-4.

an atmosphere of serenity, that they might be wholly free for the present day and duty.¹ It is difficult to read this passage and not feel that it reflects a habit of thought, and that it admits us into many a meditation of Jesus in the years before he came to the Jordan to acknowledge his longing for the kingdom of God.

The same style of argument is used by Jesus in another passage of the *Logia* that may summarize many an earnest talk. If men give good gifts to their children, how much more shall the heavenly Father give to those who ask him.² Thus the fatherly goodness of God is the sufficient reason for prayer, and the ground of assurance that no one asks in vain. The disciple should not fear even among mortal foes, for he is of more value than many sparrows, and yet God notes a sparrow's fall.³ Finally, it is still the goodness of God that is Jesus' text in his story of the man who, having a hundred sheep, lost one.⁴ As a man seeks his lost sheep, so God in his great love seeks the publican and the sinner.

So the *Logia* teaches that one of the resources of Jesus—perhaps the very greatest—was his knowledge of God. He himself believed that this knowledge was unique,⁵ that it surpassed all that had been known by prophets and wise men of old.⁶

It should never be forgotten that this knowledge of God is knowledge of his *character*, not of his works nor of his ways. There is, in the *Logia*, not only no indication that Jesus claimed this latter knowledge, but, on the contrary, there is clear evidence that on some subjects, he shared the common intelligence of his land and day. It is sufficient to mention the fact of belief in the existence of demons, that they enter into men, and that various physical ills are due to them.⁷

The *Logia* has yet one suggestion in respect to the resources of Jesus. He not only claimed a unique knowledge of God, which he believed to be man's highest good, but he also believed himself divinely appointed to reveal

¹ Mt. 6:26-34; Lk. 12:22-31.

² Mt. 7:7-11; Lk. 11:9-13.

³ Mt. 10:29-31; Lk. 12:6-7.

⁴ Mt. 18:12-14; Lk. 15:4-7.

⁵ Mt. 11:27; Lk. 10:22.

⁶ Mt. 12:41-42; Lk. 11:31-32.

⁷ Mt. 12:22-24, 43-45; Lk. 11:14, 24-26.

this knowledge. Nothing in the *Logia* is more impressive than the *tone* with which Jesus speaks. It is the calm positive tone of one who is sure of his message. "No one knoweth the Father save the Son;"¹ "Follow me and leave the dead to bury their own dead;"² "Every one who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father who is in heaven;"³ "Woe unto thee, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida!"⁴ "Behold, something greater than Jonah is here," "Behold, something greater than Solomon is here!"⁵ This sublime assurance of Jesus seems never to have made men feel that he was proud. His manner of life would have effectually disposed of such a thought had it once arisen.

Such, then, according to the *Logia*, was the extraordinary equipment of Jesus for the realization of his ideal for his people. Of his *ordinary* equipment, such as resources of physical strength, sympathetic nature, quickness and depth of insight into the souls of men, self control and poise, we learn nothing from the *Logia*. Had Jesus possessed these gifts, even in the highest measure, that fact alone would not have gone far toward the explanation of his inner or his outer life. Had he been by nature without these resources in any marked degree, still his knowledge of God's fatherly character and the conviction that he had been called to reveal that to men, for their salvation—these facts, with the peace and strength born of inner harmony with God, would help us to understand the course and the results of his ministry.

The *method* of Jesus, as reflected in the *Logia*, seems plainly to have been determined by his resources. This method was *teaching*: that is its general character. To impart to others his own knowledge of God as the center and secret of the highest life, he must gain the ear and the heart, at least this is evidently what he sought to do. And the particular details of his didactic method, both in word and in deed, were natural deductions from the consciousness of his resources.

¹ Mt. 11:27; Lk. 10:22.

² Mt. 8:22; Lk. 9:60.

³ Mt. 10:33; Lk. 12:9.

⁴ Mt. 11:21; Lk. 10:13.

⁵ Mt. 12:41-42; Lk. 10:31-32.

The first appearance of Jesus in the *Logia* is as a teacher in a group of disciples,¹ and his last appearance there is not different from the first.² How large this group of disciples was we cannot learn from the *Logia*, but about the time when they were sent out to preach, they were few in number.³ These disciples were to be *as* their master;⁴ they were to give freely as he had freely given to them.⁵ Thus it appears, even in the *Logia*, that the training of his disciples by Jesus included some actual work in the field.

But while the conspicuous fact in the *Logia*, as regards the method of Jesus, is that he sought to realize his ideal by teaching, there is another fact of importance, viz. that he healed disease. Of specific instances of healing this earliest Christian document refers to only one, that of a dumb demoniac.⁶ This appears to be mentioned by Matthew and Luke not for its own sake, but rather for the sake of the conversation that arose from it.⁷ Its actual occurrence is thus attested in the strongest manner.

The *Logia* says nothing of the manner in which Jesus cured this dumb person—what he said or did to him: it only records the fact of a cure. But Jesus, in reply to the charge of his adversaries that he had wrought the cure by Beelzebub, that is, with his aid, spoke words of the utmost significance not only in regard to this special case but in regard to all similar cases. "If I by Beelzebub cast out demons, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore shall they be your judges. But if I by the finger of God cast out demons, then is the kingdom of God come upon you."⁸ Thus Jesus argued that in accusing *him* of being in league with Beelzebub, they accused also those of their own number who cast out demons.

¹ Mt. 5:1; Lk. 6:20.

² Mt. 24:43; Lk. 12:42.

³ Mt. 9:37; Lk. 10:2; Cf. Mt. 13:33; Lk. 13:20-21.

⁴ Mt. 10:24; Lk. 6:40.

⁵ Mt. 10:8; Lk. 10:9.

⁶ Lk. 11:14; Mt. 9:32-34 (12:22-24).

⁷ Matthew, in keeping with the tendency that is very marked in the material which is peculiar to him, represents the demoniac as both dumb and blind. The fact of this tendency in Matthew, of which we speak elsewhere, leads us to regard Luke's version as the probably historical one.

⁸ Lk. 11:19-20; Mt. 12:27-28.

He therefore admitted that cures similar to his were actually wrought by others. This admission is of great value. So is also the claim of the next verse that it was by "the finger of God" (Mt. has "*Spirit of God*"), that is, by *Divine* aid, not by aid diabolical, and not in his *own* strength, that he cast out demons. Thus Jesus gave to God the glory of healing the man, and said that if this was true, it was proof that the kingdom of God had "come upon them"—was at hand and manifest.

There is a second specific incident in the *Logia* that demands attention, viz. that of the servant of a centurion who was stationed in Capernaum.¹ It has already been shown² that of the two divergent versions of this incident there is good reason for the acceptance of that by Luke. But Luke does not say that Jesus healed the servant; he does not indicate that he sent any message to the father. He records that when the messengers of the centurion returned, they found the servant whole, but he does not directly suggest that the recovery was due to Jesus. According to Matthew's version, which lets the centurion come in person to Jesus instead of sending, Jesus spoke to the man a word of comfort and promise. The cure is thus ascribed to him, and we have to think of it as we do of the cure of the Syrophenician's daughter.

But while the *Logia* refers clearly to but one specific case of healing by Jesus, it has three passages which may *imply* similar activity on his part, or on the part of his disciples. Thus it is perhaps probable that the "mighty works" done in Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum were works of healing.³ Again, there is the commission of the Twelve. Luke, in the words attributed to Jesus when the Twelve were sent out,⁴ has no authorization to heal disease, but in the words attributed to Jesus when another larger company were sent out, he has the authorization to heal the sick.⁵ This passage, by reason of its relation to Matthew, is to be ascribed to the *Logia*. But Matthew⁶ goes far beyond Luke in the authorization of

¹ Lk. 7:1-3, 6-9; 13:28-29; Mt. 8:5-13.

² See Part I, p. 42.

³ Mt. 11:21-24; Lk. 10:12-15.

⁴ Lk. 9:1-5.

⁵ Lk. 10:9.

⁶ Mt. 10:8.

the disciples to do other things than preach. He says: "Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out demons." This passage illustrates the tendency of the author of the first Gospel to emphasize the supernatural. We are not justified in ascribing to the *Logia* anything more than an injunction to heal the sick, or, better, to cast out demons.

We have to consider next the words of Jesus to the messengers from John the Baptist. He bade them tell John what they had seen and heard. Then follow these words, as though summing up what was to be heard and seen.¹ "The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached unto them." Now in one sense and one only, so far as can be learned from the *Logia*, had these words found illustration in the ministry of Jesus. They described, *spiritually*, what he had done. With the exception of cleansing lepers and raising dead persons the language is from prophetic passages about the good time that was in store for Israel.² But if this language is a fit description of the spiritual work of Jesus, according to the *Logia*, and if that document has no trace of events corresponding to this language if *literally understood*,³ that twofold fact is good evidence for taking the words *spiritually*. But there is also another consideration. Here was a question put to Jesus in regard to his mission. How should we *expect* that it would be answered? Should we expect Jesus to refer to such acts as cleansing lepers and raising the dead, or to his making the heavenly Father known? On the basis of the *Logia* there can be no doubt which course we should expect him to take.

There remains in the *Logia* a single passage that demands brief notice in this connection. Jesus spoke of a case where an unclean spirit went out of a man—presumably was *cast* out—and afterward with seven others returned.⁴ Now while this language is most naturally

¹ Mt. 11:5; Lk. 7:22.

² See Is. 35:5-6; 61:1-3.

³ The cure of demons is not specified in this message to John.

⁴ Mt. 12:43-45; Lk. 11:24-26.

taken as referring to some experience which Jesus himself had had with a demoniac—some case of a cure that was succeeded by a state worse than the first—there seems to be no reason why he might not have used it as a result of observation, apart from any experience of his own.

To sum up the evidence of the *Logia* on this point. Jesus cured a dumb demoniac, and bade his disciples do similar works. In the cure of the demoniac he felt that it was God's "Spirit" or "finger" that wrought through him. We must suppose that he expected his disciples to cast out demons in reliance on the same Divine aid. He admitted also that demons were cast out by the Jewish exorcists. From this it seems to follow that his cure of the demoniac did not necessarily imply any *extraordinary* resource. If Jewish exorcists cast out demons, how much more would demons flee before the pure, beneficent and vastly potent personality of Jesus! His resource of unique knowledge of the heavenly Father, and his resource of strength and courage wrapped up in the conviction of his supreme office as revealer of the Father, would not only make him an absolute opponent of everything that he regarded as demoniacal, but would give him—so at least it would seem to us—a consciousness of *superiority* to demons, and a sure confidence that they must yield before him. However this may have been, the source with which we are now concerned suggests no difference whatever between his power to cast out a demon and his power to do any act of his ministry. As to the disciples, he bade them preach the kingdom of God and cast out demons—language which seems to take for granted that if they were prepared to do the first thing, they were prepared also to do the second.¹

When now we come down from the *Logia* to the common tradition of the synoptists we find some fresh illustrations of the view that the peculiar resources of Jesus were knowledge of God and conviction that he was sent to make God known. Thus the saying of Jesus that he came to call sinners² and that he had authority to forgive

¹ According to Lk. 10:17 the disciples actually cured demoniacs.

² Mk. 2:17; Mt. 9:13; Lk. 5:32.

sin¹ were but a natural and logical and glad utterance of his vision of God's fatherly character. The declaration that his disciples were like "sons of the bride-chamber," glad of heart because he was with them,² and the teaching that no statutes of the past were to be allowed to encroach on this joy and freedom,³ were also simple deductions from that vision. These words witness to the consciousness of such lofty resources as an unique knowledge of God and a Divine call to reveal that knowledge to men. It was because Jesus was master of these resources that he said: "Whosoever shall cause one of these little ones that believe on me to stumble, it were better for him if a great millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea,"⁴ and again, that he said, in view of the treachery of Judas: "Woe unto that man through whom the Son of Man is betrayed."⁵ One might almost say that such words were uttered by Jesus because he was *mastered* by these sublime resources, because he felt that God's revelation in him constituted the supreme call to man's better self.

But we have not yet touched the most characteristic feature of the common synoptic tradition. There is no single term with which this feature may be historically described unless it be that which is found once in the *Logia*⁶ and once in the oldest Gospel,⁷ on the lips of Jesus, viz. "mighty works" (*δυνάμεις*). This term we shall employ, though it is obviously popular and indefinite.

Mighty works are the most conspicuous element of the common synoptic tradition. There are eleven of these described in some detail, which together constitute about one-sixth part of the entire Gospel of Mark. Besides these there is a general reference to a number of cures accomplished one evening in front of Peter's house in Capernaum.⁸ Two of the eleven specific mighty works

¹ Mk. 2:10; Mt. 9:6; Lk. 5:24.

² Mk. 2:19; Mt. 9:15; Lk. 5:34.

³ Mk. 2:23-28; 3:1-6; Mt. 12:1-14; Lk. 6:1-11.

⁴ Mk. 9:42; Mt. 18:6; Lk. 17:2.

⁵ Mk. 14:21; Mt. 26:24; Lk. 22:22.

⁶ Mt. 11:21; Lk. 10:13.

⁷ Mk. 9:39.

⁸ Mk. 1:32-34; Mt. 8:16-17; Lk. 4:40-41.

are cures of demoniacs, two have to do with nature rather than with man, one is the resuscitation of Jairus' daughter, and the remaining six have to do with as many different physical conditions—fever, leprosy, paralysis, palsy, hemorrhage and blindness.

How do these "mighty works" stand related to the resources of Jesus with which the *Logia* makes us acquainted—resources that are purely spiritual? Must we now add something to those resources?

Of the restoration of two demoniacs nothing need be said beyond that which was said in the early part of the chapter. The words of Jesus show how he regarded the cure of demoniacs. Nor need many words be said today of the adequacy of purely spiritual influence to the overcoming of physical diseases as grave as paralysis and leprosy. The cures at Trèves in 1891 included blindness and paralysis, *lupus*, chronic inflammation of the spinal cord, cancerous tumor and St. Vitus' dance.¹ These cures were accomplished in persons who looked in faith upon the Holy Coat. On the evidence of trustworthy physicians no medical explanation of these particular cures could be given. We are then shut up to the conclusion that it was by the power of faith. But if faith in the Holy Coat was instrumental in effecting these cures, it is surely not difficult to believe that faith in Jesus once effected similar cures.

The case of the little daughter of Jairus was not essentially different from these. We must judge of it by the words of Jesus. He said that the child was not dead.² He was summoned to heal a person who was *at the point of death*,³ and when he had reached the house and presumably had seen the girl, he contradicted the report which had gone forth that she was dead. As in the case of Peter's wife's mother, he took the child's hand and summoned her to rise up. It is clear that in Jesus's thought, his act was the resuscitation of a girl who was only apparently dead. It was therefore an act quite as explicable as those which have just been men-

¹ See Holtzmann, *Leben Jesu*, pp. 149-150.

² Mk. 5:39; Mt. 9:24; Lk. 8:52.

³ On Mt. 9:18 see Part I, p. 26.

tioned. His calmness, his hand-grasp, his confident summons—these aroused the girl, and gave her new life. Since people had thought that the child was dead, it was very easy and natural for the belief soon to arise that Jesus had raised a dead person to life. It was an age when people were eager to believe in the arbitrary and freakish invasion of life by invisible beings clothed with superhuman powers, and the disciples, when they came to tell the story, naturally told it in the way which they thought would honor Jesus most. But fortunately they preserved his own words, and in the light of these we must judge of the event.

But the spiritual resources of Jesus do not appear to be adequate to account for the two mighty works which remain to be noticed, viz. the stilling of the storm on the Lake of Galilee¹ and the feeding of a great multitude with five loaves and two fishes.² Here we have no longer to do with susceptible human spirits and the mysterious reactions from the spirit on the body, but with inanimate matter—the bread and fish, and with forces of nature—the winds and the waves. These narratives therefore, as they stand, are at variance with the older record in which we learn of the resources of Jesus through his own words.

All the preceding nine mighty works of the common synoptic tradition lead to the question whether, in the actual occurrence on the lake and in the actual experience with the multitude, Jesus did not, after all, have to do not with forces of nature and with inanimate matter, but with human minds and hearts. If, guided by the character of all the other mighty works, we proceed to these two exceptional ones, which on their face appear to be excluded by the high authority of the *Logia*, we shall think that the actual occurrence on the lake was the restoration of calmness and confidence and strength by the presence and words of Jesus who had been awakened from sleep, and that the actual occurrence when the multitude were satisfied from five loaves and two little fishes was that Jesus gave himself to them in such an outpouring of

¹ Mk. 4:35-41; Mt. 8:18, 23-27; Lk. 8:22-25.

² Mk. 6:30-44; Mt. 14:13-21; Lk. 9:10-17.

grace and wisdom that they became oblivious of their physical condition.

To this reconstruction we are led not only by the conception of himself which we have from Jesus in the *Logia* and by the character of all the other mighty works of the common synoptic tradition; but, on the other hand, by the serious objections that present themselves to the view that Jesus exercised omnipotent power. These objections need not be presented at length. There is, first, the obvious consideration that neither of the two situations *called* for anything beyond what the spiritual resources of Jesus could supply. As to the peril on the lake, the calmness and confidence of a single person have more than once brought deliverance from similar danger; and as to the satisfaction of the multitude, if the printed Gospel of Jesus has often beguiled the heart of man into complete forgetfulness of physical conditions, much more may that Gospel as it fell from the lips of Jesus himself have wrought a like effect.

There is, second, the consideration that Jesus, in the wilderness, had rejected the popular Messianic rôle which involved such astounding manifestations as turning stones into bread or leaping unharmed from lofty precipices. To suppose that he saved the boat by silencing the winds and laying the billows, or that he multiplied the loaves and fishes to the actual filling of five thousand men, with a surplus of twelve baskets, is to make him recede from the high spiritual ground on which he stood in the wilderness. Are we ready to do that? Is it more likely that he—the spiritual leader of the race—was inconstant in his spiritual purpose, or that the wonder-loving disciples, perhaps many years after his death, exaggerated mighty but explicable events into unspiritual displays of what we can hardly call by a better name than omnipotent magic? For man has nowhere discovered the power of God working arbitrarily: the deeper he has penetrated into nature, the more perfectly has he become convinced that “order,” if not “heaven’s *first* law,” is yet an inviolable law of Heaven. To command two dead fish to become fifty or five hundred is surely far removed from God’s way, who

says to the living, "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the waters in the seas" (Gen. 1:22). One might credit a wizard with such a command, but the sane spiritual method of Jesus was the very antipodes of wizardry.

We conclude then that the mighty works of Jesus, according to the common tradition of the synoptists, do not justify us in any departure from that conception of his extraordinary resources which we find in his own words in the *Logia*.

As to the *method* of Jesus according to the common synoptic tradition, we find here two significant points of which the *Logia* has no trace. We have seen in that document that the disciples of Jesus, about the time when they went out to teach, were few; the synoptic tradition informs us definitely that he had a circle of *twelve* who alone were with him on certain important occasions.¹ These twelve, according to the oldest Gospel,² were with Jesus a considerable time before he sent them out to teach; these were with him at Caesarea Philippi,³ and it was they with whom he observed the last Passover, and to whom he gave memorial bread and wine.⁴ Thus it seems that Jesus, though speaking to crowds and sowing his good tidings broadcast, gave himself in an especial manner to a little group of men, probably the most receptive and the most promising for the work he had in mind of all who gathered around him. This agrees thoroughly with the fact that the extraordinary resources of Jesus were of a spiritual sort. If the kingdom of God was merely to be announced as an approaching event, it would hardly have been necessary to prepare men to make that announcement by a long course of training. Moreover, if in the thought of Jesus the kingdom of God had been a worldly political state, it does not appear probable that, in preparing for its introduction into the world, he would have chosen only a dozen men and these from the walks of common life. But this accords perfectly with the fact that he felt himself called to reveal to men the fatherly

¹ Mk. 3:14; Mt. 10:2; Lk. 6:13.

² Mt. obscures this fact, Luke follows Mark.—Mk. 3:14; 6:7.

³ Mk. 8:27; Mt. 16:13; Lk. 9:18.

⁴ Mk. 14:17; Mt. 26:20; Lk. 22:14.

character of God, which was not different from setting up the rule of God in their hearts. For the accomplishment of *this* purpose it was natural that he chose men from the common walks of life, and natural also, as it seems to us now, that he chose only a small group, that he might come near to them individually, and by intensive effort might the sooner and the more deeply reflect his vision into their souls.

The second point regarding the method of Jesus that we meet first in the common synoptic tradition is that he communicated to his chosen inner group one fact at least which was not declared to the public, or even to that part of the public which was friendly to him, and this fact was fundamental in character. To this small circle alone he imparted, in his own way, his Messianic claim.¹ This was at Caesarea Philippi,² near the close of the Galilean ministry. The one aspect of this fact which we wish to mention in the present connection is that, even with those who stood nearest to him, Jesus came gradually, by a long process of teaching, to speak of the personal secret of his mission. He had spoken freely of the heavenly Father, and had given ample ground for those who had spiritual insight to see in him the Father's supreme revealer, but he had not told his disciples that he held himself to be the Messiah. The reason for this long reserve is probably the wide difference between his thought of Messiahship and theirs. Until he had established a strong personal bond between the disciples and himself he could not expect that they would listen to his secret, seeing that his course of action was utterly unlike what was popularly associated with the Messiah. The human heart was ready to hear the gracious message of the heavenly Father, but Jesus had to *create* an audience to whom he could declare his conviction in regard to his own relation to that Father and his kingdom.

It remains now to consider what bearing the peculiar material of Matthew and Luke has upon the subject of the Resources and the Method of Jesus.

¹ The affirmation of it on the day of his trial is of course excepted.

² Mk. 8:27-29; Mt. 16:13-16; Lk. 9:18-20.

The words of Jesus to his disciples in the Sermon on the Mount—"ye are the salt of the earth," "ye are the light of the world"¹—if not from the *Logia*, yet present no conception which is at variance with that document. The lofty mission of his disciples implies of course a consciousness that his own mission was lofty, and the *character* of his own mission is clearly suggested by the ultimate goal which is held up before them, viz. that the Father may be glorified. This accords with the view that his first extraordinary resource was a unique knowledge of God. It is by virtue of that knowledge—knowledge, be it remembered, which, as in the case of Jesus, determines the whole life—that the disciples are the salt which preserves the earth from utter corruption and the light of mankind into a larger and better day.²

In Luke's peculiar material, that which bears most directly on the resources of Jesus is the parable of the Lost Son.³ The situation out of which this sprang was important. Jesus was receiving publicans and sinners, and the scribes and Pharisees were murmuring. In defense of his conduct Jesus told this story. While speaking in terms of an earthly father and son, his argument looked toward a higher relationship, even that of God to the sinner. Thus we come back again to the fundamental fact that he regarded his ministry as a revelation of the character of the heavenly Father.

It appears then that the conclusion to be drawn from the *Logia* in regard to the peculiar resources of Jesus and in regard to his method is not essentially modified either by the common synoptic tradition, or—with the exceptions noted above—by the material which is found in Matthew or Luke. That conclusion may now be restated: The extraordinary resources of Jesus were unique knowledge of God's character and the conviction

¹ Mt. 5:13, 14.

² If Mt. 11:28-30 be regarded as from the lips of Jesus, it illustrates the view of his extraordinary resources which is derived from the *Logia*. The language, however, is peculiarly Matthaean. Three of the important terms—*ζυγός πραύς*, *ἐλυφρόν*—are not found in the other Gospels, and a fourth—*χρηστός*—is not found in the other Gospels in a moral sense, as here. Not only so, but the thought of the passage has parallels in John rather than in the synoptists (e.g., 8:12; 11:25).

³ Lk. 15:8-32.

of a unique mission as the revealer of that character; and his method, innerly accordant with these resources, was that of personal spiritual influence by word and by example.

CHAPTER VII

THE PUBLIC CAREER: FROM THE JORDAN TO CAESAREA PHILIPPI

WHEN the earlier and the later strata of the Gospel narratives are discriminated, and their relative historical value appraised, as is now increasingly done by scholars, the general picture of the public career of Jesus is deeply affected. It is the purpose of this chapter and the two following ones to consider that career as a whole on the basis of such discrimination of the sources. No attention will be given to those views of the public ministry of Jesus which rest upon the traditional estimate of the various Gospels. The aim is not controversial, but purely constructive. The fundamental Christian document is the *Logia* and therefore our survey must begin with this. Though it is a collection of the *sayings* of Jesus, it is not wholly devoid of light on the course of his life. If we had this document and nothing more, we should conclude that Jesus, after the experience in the wilderness, labored as a teacher on the northwest of the Lake of Galilee;¹ that Capernaum, Chorazin, and Bethsaida were the main centers of his activity;² that at some time he visited Jerusalem;³ that his ministry continued for some months at least, for it is assumed that his "generation" had become acquainted with him,⁴ and disciples were won and trained of whom the Master said: "He that receiveth you receiveth me,"⁵ and finally, we should conclude that, though the opposition to him was bitter,⁶ his success was marked.⁷

¹ Mt. 8:5; Lk. 7:1; Mt. 11:21; Lk. 10:13; Mt. 11:23; Lk. 10:15.

² Matt. 11:20-24; Lk. 10:13-16.

³ Mt. 23:37; Lk. 13:34. Note, however, that Luke puts the lament over Jerusalem, at a distance from the capital. See Lk. 13:34-35.

⁴ Mt. 11:16-19; Lk. 16:31-35.

⁵ Mt. 10:40.

⁶ Mt. 11:19; Lk. 16:34; Mt. 11:21; Lk. 10:13; Mt. 12:27; Lk. 11:19.

⁷ Mt. 11:25; Lk. 10:21.

With the exception of one point, all this outline is taken up by the earliest narrative. That point is the ministry of Jesus in Chorazin and Bethsaida. The language of the *Logia* implies a somewhat prolonged stay in both these places, yet the oldest narrative has no trace of a visit to either of them. This fact suggests that between the ministry of Jesus and the composition of the oldest Gospel some events in his public career had become indistinct, or been forgotten; it also plainly suggests that the words of the *Logia* had peculiar sacredness, for in this case at least they were preserved and handed down even when the background needful for their understanding was entirely lacking.

Such is our oldest sketch of the career of Jesus, most meagre yet most trustworthy.

We pass on from the *Logia* to the earliest Gospel. This also represents the ministry of Jesus as beginning by the Lake of Galilee, and apparently in immediate succession after the experience in the wilderness. For though the synoptists all mention the imprisonment of the Baptist as preceding Jesus' return to Galilee,¹ they do not seem to have thought that there was an indefinite interval between the temptation and the beginning of the Galilean work. They certainly knew of no preaching of the Gospel by Jesus until he came into Galilee and knew of no disciples won by him before that. Their description of these things is manifestly the description of what was *new*, or what they *supposed* was new.² If Peter was the chief source of Mark's Gospel, it would seem very strange that he could have represented his discipleship to Jesus as beginning at the lake near Capernaum if, as the Johannine narrative has it, he had already received his new name from Jesus,³ and had been with him in Cana and Capernaum, Jerusalem and Samaria, and only *after* that had come into Galilee to labor.⁴

The ministry of Jesus then, according to the earliest Gospel, began by the Lake of Galilee, more definitely it

¹ Mk. 1:14; Mt. 4:12; Lk. 3:20.

² Mk. 1:14-15; Mt. 4:17; Lk. 4:14-15.

³ Jn. 1:41-42.

⁴ Jn. 2:1, 12, 13; 4:1-42, 43-45.

began in the town of Capernaum where the two first disciples, Peter and Andrew, lived,¹ presumably also James and John who were called to discipleship at the same time with Peter and Andrew and in the same place.²

Whether Jesus on his return from the Jordan and the wilderness went directly to Capernaum, as the narrative of Mark implies,³ or first visited his home in Nazareth, as the later narrative of Matthew reports,⁴ cannot be positively determined, but fortunately is unimportant. Whatever moved him thereto, the fact is that he began preaching and won his first disciples in Capernaum. It is of course possible that he had become acquainted with one or more of these first disciples while at the Jordan with the Baptist, and the narrative of John⁵ may have to that extent a historical basis.

The winning of these four fishermen was the great event of the first stay in Capernaum. What they had seen in Jesus that induced them to drop their nets and follow him we are not told. It is probably safe to say that he had "fished" for them, but whether in private conversation, or only in the general preaching of the kingdom of God, cannot be said. As he promised to make them "fishers of men,"⁶ he must have believed that he possessed the secret, and perhaps they were the earliest evidence that this belief was well founded.

But the winning of four disciples, though the most important event of this first stay in Capernaum, was not the most conspicuous and exciting. That distinction belongs to the cures which Jesus performed in Peter's house,⁷ at the door of his house,⁸ and probably, first of all, in the synagogue.⁹ The nature of these and other cures by Jesus was briefly discussed in the last chapter, and need not interrupt our general sketch of his life.

¹ Mk. 1:29; Mt. 8:14; Lk. 4:38.

² Mk. 1:19; Mt. 4:21; cf. Lk. 4:10.

³ Mk. 1:14, 16.

⁴ Mt. 4:13.

⁵ Jn. 1:35-42.

⁶ Mk. 1:17; Mt. 4:19; Lk. 4:10.

⁷ Mk. 1:29-31; Mt. 8:14-15; Lk. 4:38-39.

⁸ Mk. 1:32-34; Mt. 8:16, 17; Lk. 4: 40-41.

⁹ Mk. 1:21-28; Lk. 4:31-37. This cure is not in Matthew, hence not strictly a part of the common tradition.

How long this first visit in Capernaum was we have no means of determining. The cures seem all to have been wrought on one day,¹ and on the day following Jesus with his four disciples left Capernaum to visit neighboring places.²

This is the next fixed point in the career of Jesus,³ and though extremely vague, it is important. Here was a tour of which no single specific incident has been preserved unless the cure of a leper belongs in it.⁴ Yet according to the earliest account it covered all the province of Galilee⁵—a densely-populated region of some 1600 square miles. If we think of the tour as consisting of such visits as that in Capernaum—and we have absolutely no other clue to its general character—we shall picture Jesus with his four disciples passing rapidly from town to town. That the tour included *all* the cities and villages of Galilee we cannot suppose. Such a journey would have filled many months with uninterrupted traveling and labors, and can hardly have occurred without leaving some further traces of itself than a single meagre verse. If Jesus visited a dozen towns somewhat widely scattered, that would justify the language of our narratives. However extensive the tour may have been, the preaching of Jesus was in the synagogues—a circumstance which shows that, in Galilee at least, if a man had a message and was a man of power, his formal right to preach was not too closely scrutinized.

It appears that this tour was broken off in consequence of one of the "mighty works" of Jesus, viz. the cure of a leper. As after the notable day in Capernaum Jesus retired to a solitary place, so now, leaving his work, he does the same.⁶ That he had apprehended such a consequence seems to follow from the strict injunction to

¹ Mk. 1:23, 29, 32, 35.

² According to Mk. 1:38 Jesus said that he had come forth (i.e., from Capernaum) that he might preach in neighboring towns, but according to Lk. 4:43 he struck a higher note and said that he had been "sent" (i.e., from God) to preach the kingdom in other cities. In both cases he intimated clearly that his departure from Capernaum was due to a definite purpose, and that he was not subject to recall at the wish of the crowd.

³ Mk. 1:39; Mt. 4:23; Lk. 4:44.

⁴ Mk. 1:40; Mt. 8:2; Lk. 5:12.

⁵ Mk. 1:39.

⁶ Mk. 1:45; Lk. 5:15-16.

the man to say nothing of the event. The incident shows clearly that one might be healed by his faith in Jesus and yet be disloyal to him. It must have brought home to the Master the fact that his cures might seriously interfere with the work which he had most at heart.

What drew Jesus back to Capernaum after this indefinite tour we can only conjecture. His disciples may have needed to visit their homes, or the outlook in Capernaum may have been more promising than elsewhere. The somewhat extended sojourn in the lake-city which now began proved to be of very great importance for the new religious movement. From a reference to ripening grain¹ we may infer that Jesus came back to the lake about the first of June. Several circumstances suggest, but only suggest, that his second visit continued for some weeks at least. Such are the references to apparently two Sabbaths;² the fact that his mother and brothers, having heard in Nazareth what was being done, came down to Capernaum hoping to take Jesus home with them;³ and especially the fact that people from *distant* parts of the land came to Capernaum to see him and to be healed.

It seems altogether probable that Jesus during this period of labor in Capernaum lodged with Peter and Andrew, for Mark's Gospel, which was based to some extent on Peter's teaching, plainly implies this relationship.⁵ If this view be correct, then it localizes several important incidents. It must have been the roof of Peter's house that was partly uncovered to allow the paralytic's cot to be lowered into the room where Jesus was sitting;⁶ it was in Peter's house where Jesus sat surrounded by receptive hearers when his mother and brothers wished him to come out to them;⁷ and it may have been there also that his disciples asked him the meaning of the parable of the Sower and other parables,⁸

¹ Mk. 2:23; Mt. 12:1; Lk. 6:1.

² Mk. 2:23; 3:2; Mt. 12:1, 10; Lk. 6:1, 6.

³ Mk. 3:21, 31-35; Mt. 12:46-50; Lk. 8:19-21.

⁴ Mk. 3:8; Mt. 4:25; Lk. 6:17.

⁵ Mk. 1:29, 32; 2:1.

⁶ Mk. 2:4; Lk. 5:19.

⁷ Mk. 3:31; Mt. 12:46; Lk. 8:19, 20.

⁸ Mk. 4:10.

in which case the saying about the lamp and stand, the bushel and the bed, may have been uttered with these utensils and furniture in sight and at hand.

This second visit in Capernaum is noteworthy for the rapid development of opposition to Jesus. His assumption of authority to forgive sin made certain scribes who were present evil affected toward him, but their hostile feeling seems not to have expressed itself in words at once;¹ and his call of Levi the taxgatherer to discipleship led the scribes to speak slurringly of him as one who ate and drank with publicans and sinners—a grievous offense against their ceremonial code.² The act of his disciples in plucking heads of grain on the Sabbath was brought against him as an infraction of the Sabbath law;³ his cure of a withered hand on the Sabbath filled his critics with rage;⁴ and his power to cast out demons was declared to come from Beelzebub the prince of demons.⁵ The freedom of his disciples in the matter of fasting was also looked upon as blameworthy not only by Pharisees but also by the disciples of the Baptist.⁶ Thus Jesus was now criticized on all sides, but only by the religious authorities. Disregard of the traditional law was the chief source of opposition and engendered the intense bitterness that malignantly ascribed his good works to Beelzebub.

The manner in which Jesus met these attacks shows that, though he came from a humble calling in a humble community, he had thought deeply on moral and religious questions and had reached perfectly definite conclusions, which did not accord with the orthodox views of the synagogue. Thus in defense of his authority to forgive sin he healed the paralytic; in reply to the contemptuous remark about associating with publicans and sinners he said it was the sick who needed a physician. The freedom of his disciples in the matter of fasting he defended

¹ That they thought him guilty of "blasphemy" may have been inferred from their looks and gestures.

² Mk. 2:16; Mt. 9:11; Lk. 5:30.

³ Mk. 2:24; Mt. 12:2; Lk. 6:2.

⁴ Mk. 3:6; Mt. 12:14; Lk. 6:11.

⁵ Mk. 3:22; Mt. 12:24; Lk. 11:15.

⁶ Mk. 2:18; Mt. 9:14; Lk. 5:33.

on the ground that the present was for them a time of joy; the charge that his disciples had done an unlawful thing in plucking grain on the Sabbath he easily refuted out of the Scriptures, adding the enfranchising word that the Son of Man is lord of the Sabbath;¹ the attempt to get a valid accusation against him as a violator of the Sabbath by his cure of disease he met with the principle that it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath—the assertion of sound moral instinct as against the refinements of ceremonial law; and the charge of partnership with Beelzebub he demolished with simple but unanswerable logic.

A second characteristic feature of this visit in Capernaum was that, in spite of the unconcealed opposition of the religious authorities, the new movement was greatly strengthened. The winning of Levi and the acceptance of his hospitality by Jesus seems to have been accompanied by a general turning to him of publicans and sinners.² The number of genuine disciples became so large that Jesus was able to choose twelve men with a view to sending them forth as co-workers.³ The first four of the twelve were the men who had been with Jesus on his early tour from Capernaum, and Matthew, according to the author of the first Gospel,⁴ was identical with the publican Levi, of whose call the oldest Gospel gives an account. Of the remaining seven men the synoptic tradition contains no information beyond what is found in the list of names. It is significant that one of them (Simon) was known as the "Zealot," that is, an adherent of Judas of Gamala. That a man should have passed from the party which advocated radical revolutionary measures to the circle of the disciples of Jesus whose teaching was purely spiritual is a testimony not only to his personal power but also to his confidence that the influence of his message would blend into one the most diverse elements. A tax-gatherer and a Zealot were as far apart as possible in their political views, one a servant and the other a sworn enemy of the Roman

¹ Mk. 2:28; Mt. 12:8; Lk. 6:5.

² Mk. 2:15; Mt. 9:10; Lk. 5:29.

³ Mk. 3:14; Mt. 10:2; Lk. 6:13.

⁴ Mt. 9:9.

government. Of the other men—Philip and Bartholomew, Thomas and James of Alphaeus, Thaddeus and Judas Iscariot—the synoptic tradition gives no information. The natural presumption is that, as Jesus had worked only in Galilee, they were Galileans, but that cannot be certainly affirmed. We know nothing of their respective vocations. The lack of agreement between Luke's list of names and that of the oldest Gospel¹ is without explanation. The fact that Peter was one of the sources of Mark's Gospel, as well as the somewhat more archaic form of Mark's list,² speaks for the historical correctness of the name "Thaddeus" rather than Luke's designation "Judas son of James."

A third notable feature of this second stay in Capernaum is the fact that people were drawn thither from distant parts of the land. This is hardly to be counted as a mark of the true growth of the new movement. Jesus, on one occasion, was forced to betake himself to a boat in order to get an opportunity to speak to the people, so great was the rush for healing,³ and it is not improbable that his crossing to the east side of the lake⁴ was to escape a multitude whose chief motive in coming to him was either curiosity to witness some of his works or the desire for healing. Superstition in regard to him as a healer was so gross that people located a magical power in his very garments,⁵ and thus thought of him as a sort of dynamo of curative energies quite apart from his will.⁶ It is obvious that where people regarded Jesus in this light, their thronging him was not promotive of his spiritual ends. The fact that many flocked to Capernaum from afar, to be healed, is clear evidence that the physicians of the time were inefficient, and it may be that a knowledge of this truth inclined the merciful heart of Jesus the more strongly to alleviate physical suffering

¹ Mk. 3:18; Lk. 6:16.

² The name "Boanerges," which appears only in Mark, points to his priority. We can understand why, in later times, this was dropped, because of the criticism it involved, more readily than we can regard it as an invention of Mark.

³ Mk. 3:9.

⁴ Mk. 4:35; Mt. 8:18; Lk. 8:22.

⁵ Mk. 5:28; Mt. 9:21; Lk. 8:44.

⁶ Even the evangelists shared this view. See Mk. 5:30; Lk. 8:45-46.

whenever he could, though he soon became aware that healing interfered with preaching. The perception of this fact accounts for the strictness with which he enjoined silence on those who had seen the resuscitation of the little daughter of Jairus.¹ Whether this injunction was successful we do not know. It is suggestive, however, that this act in the house of Jairus closed the second period of ministry in Capernaum, so far as our sources inform us.

We have now reached a chapter in the public life of Jesus which is in some respects more obscure than what has gone before. In the interval between his departure from Capernaum and his journey to Caesarea Philippi² Luke follows the earliest Gospel only in the mission of the Twelve, their return to Jesus, and the story of the feeding of the great multitude.³ The other material which Mark and Matthew put in this interval is wanting in Luke.⁴

If we follow the earliest Gospel, when Jesus left Capernaum he made a tour of some extent with the Twelve, and on this tour visited his native town.⁵ We have no clue to the extent or the duration of this tour,⁶ no incident from it except the visit in Nazareth. His rejection in his native town, by people who had long known him as a private citizen, must have had its own peculiar bitterness for him. Further, this incident throws the first shadow on the record of Jesus' career as a doer of mighty works. Here the unbelieving attitude of people toward him made this kind of ministry in the main impossible.

The next luminous point in the history of Jesus is the sending of the twelve apostles. They had been with him now for some weeks—four of them longer than the rest

¹ Mk. 5:43; Lk. 8:56.

² Mk. 8:27; Mt. 16:13; Lk. 9:18.

³ Lk. 9:1-5, 10, 11-17.

⁴ His account of a visit to Nazareth is doubtless parallel to Mk. 6:1-6, though placed by him *before* the *first* visit in Capernaum; and he has a reminiscence of Mk. 8:11-12 but in a different setting (Lk. 11:16, 29).

⁵ Mk. 6:1, 6, 7.

⁶ Mark's *καὶ αὐτοὶ* (6:6) may suggest that he thought of the region lying about Nazareth. Matthew's comprehensive statement, "all the cities and the villages" (9:35), seems hardly to accord with the subsequent mission of the Twelve.

—and he must have come to know them well. It appears that he sent them to say and to do what they had heard and seen him do: that they were to be continuators of the movement which he had inaugurated. The directions given them suggest that they were not expected to go very far or be gone a great while,¹ and that they were not to anticipate uniformly good treatment.² It does not appear from what place they went forth, or to what place they returned, or how long the tour lasted. Since Capernaum was certainly the home of some of them and had been the center of Jesus' work thus far, it is not unlikely that they went forth with the understanding that they were to return thither after their tour had been completed.³ No details of the work and experience of the Twelve have been preserved. It is, however, stated in a general way that they preached and healed.⁴ Where Jesus himself was during this absence of the apostles can only be conjectured.

Soon after the return of the Twelve—at Capernaum, if this town was indeed their *rendezvous*—Jesus summoned them to go apart with him to some quiet spot, for a little rest.⁵ This quiet spot, according to the following account, was somewhere on the shore of the lake,⁶ and, to judge from Mark 6:45, on the *west* side of the lake.⁷ From this spot, after the notable experience with a great multitude, Jesus sent his disciples away by boat to "Bethsaida."⁸ When, however, they came to land, they were not at Bethsaida, but on the coast of Gennesaret.⁹ The wind had beaten them back from the point which they set out to make.

What Jesus had sought to avoid by going from Capernaum to a solitary spot somewhere on the shore of the lake now awaited him on the following day in the thickly

¹ Mk. 6:8-9; Mt. 10:9-10; Lk. 9:3.

² Mk. 6:11; Mt. 10:14; Lk. 9:5.

³ Mk. 1:30, 32 favors this view.

⁴ Mk. 6:12-13; Lk. 9:6.

⁵ Mk. 6:31. Mt. 14:13 gives the Baptist's death as the occasion of the retirement of Jesus at this time.

⁶ Mk. 6:33.

⁷ Luke's statement that they withdrew to "a city called Bethsaida" (9:10) is not in harmony with Mark.

⁸ Mk. 6:45.

⁹ Mk. 6:53; Mt. 14:34.

populated Gennesaret plain. He was at once recognized as the great healer, and whichever way he turned he was beset by those who craved healing.¹ It is notable that he is not said to have healed anyone,² although he was thus thronged—an indication of a change of mind. Of this we shall have confirmation as we follow down the course of events.

It was about this time that Jesus was confronted with a new accusation from the scribes and Pharisees, viz. that he disregarded ceremonial cleansing.³ And this charge was doubtless quite true. Jesus in his reply to the criticism declared that the tradition of the ⁴elders—ceremonial cleansing belonged to that tradition—was radically opposed to the commandment of God. He cited a case in point. A man is bound by the Law to honor father and mother, but according to the elders' tradition, what was rightfully due to parents might be withheld by merely pronouncing over it the word "korban" (=a gift, i.e., to the Lord). Thus God's word was made of no effect.

So much for the traditional law in general. As to the particular rite of ceremonial hand-washing, which was neglected by the disciples of Jesus, he said, in substance, that it was an insignificant matter. A man is defiled by that which comes from within him, and not by what he eats, still less therefore by *touching* what he eats with hands that are not ceremonially clean. Jesus thus virtually denied that the rite for which his critics stood had a valid basis. This was not a formal attack on the Levitical law, but it was a relegation of ceremonialism to the class of things that are relatively unimportant.⁴ Any man who took this position in the time of Jesus was doomed. He might escape for a season, but his fate was sealed.

The presence of hostile scribes and Pharisees from Jerusalem,⁵ together with the fact that people thronged

¹ Mk. 6:55-56; Mt. 14:35-36.

² People are said to have touched him with good results, but he could hardly have prevented this when in the midst of crowds.

³ Mk. 7:1-23; Mt. 15:1-20.

⁴ Cf. Mt. 23:23-26.

⁵ Mk. 7:1; Mt. 15:1.

him for physical healing, probably led Jesus to take a trip to the north, beyond the borders of Galilee. In the region of Tyre and Sidon he was in the Roman province of Syria, in a land predominantly Gentile,¹ but from there around to the east of the lake, by a way through the midst of Decapolis,² he may not have left the territory of Philip. Here again the record is exceedingly meagre. There is no clue to the time spent on this trip except the mere fact of the distance from place to place, nor is there any suggestion as to how Jesus and the Twelve were occupied. That he was teaching them and training them to promote the new movement may safely be assumed, but with the exception of a single incident the entire trip is a perfect blank. That incident—the meeting with a Gentile woman who craved healing for her demonized daughter³—is important in various respects. It shows that Jesus was unwilling to have here a repetition of the scenes he had recently witnessed by the lake. He did at length grant the woman's request, but only when moved thereto by her extraordinary trust. It seems also to show that Jesus did not look upon Gentiles as having, *at present*, any claim upon his ministry. *First*, the children at the table—this was his thought; then, the little pet dogs under the table.⁴ If this discrimination between Jews and Gentiles by Jesus shocks us, it is to be noticed that it is not so harsh as it at first appears. If the Gentiles are to have the blessings of the Gospel, though not at once, then they must be regarded as capable of receiving those blessings; in other words, they are after all on the same plane with the Jews. Thus the word "first" takes away much of the sting of the term "little dogs." It may be inferred from the words of Jesus to this woman that he did not regard his work for the "children" as finished, although when he left Galilee the prospect of continuing his labor there was not hopeful.

What led Jesus to return by way of the Decapolis and

¹ Mk. 7:24; Mt. 15:21.

² Mk. 7:31.

³ Mk. 7:25-30; Mt. 15:22-28.

⁴ Mk. 7:27.—Matthew omits this idea of *order*, and therefore is decidedly further removed from the sympathy and gentleness of Jesus.

to make a stop on the east side of the lake can only be conjectured. Possibly it was that he might learn the state of feeling in Capernaum and the vicinity while being himself somewhat hidden and beyond easy reach. Mark's account of a cure which he wrought when he reached the east shore is highly suggestive.¹ Jesus took the deaf man apart from the crowd; he made use of physical agents in the cure, putting his fingers into the man's ears for the deafness and putting spittle on his tongue for the dumbness—a course of procedure not said to have been adopted in any instance thus far; he uttered an inarticulate prayer before speaking the word of healing—a feature hitherto wanting in the accounts of healing, though quite germane to the principle found in the *Logia* in connection with the charge that he wrought his cures with the aid of Beelzebub; and finally, Jesus enjoined upon those who were cognizant of the healing to say nothing about it—an injunction which is said to have been disregarded.

It is clear from this account that Jesus was becoming deeply averse to the work of public healing. This change of attitude, to judge from the narrative of the last days in Galilee, was due to the fact that healing seriously interfered with his preaching.²

The movements of Jesus for a time after this incident on the east side of the lake are wholly uncertain.³ The fact that he was at once importuned to heal disease, even in this region where he was comparatively unknown, was a plain indication of what awaited him should he cross to the scene of his longest ministry on the west shore. Apparently he resolved to continue with his disciples in as quiet a mode of life as possible. Mark speaks of a trip to the parts of Dalmanutha,⁴ Matthew to the borders of Magadan,⁵ but where these towns were located, or *this*

¹ Mk. 7:32-35.—Matthew's representation that Jesus took up the work of healing on a large scale (15:29-30) is excluded by the character of Mark's narrative and by the general situation.

² The modern parallel to the cures by Jesus is not the medical mission but the faith-cults.

³ The incident of Mk. 8:1-9, Mt. 15:32-39 is probably a duplicate of the feeding of five thousand.

⁴ Mk. 8:10.

⁵ Mt. 15:39.

town, for both names may refer to the same place, it is not possible to say. It is significant that just as Jesus is not said to have entered Tyre or Sidon, so here he is not said to have *entered* Dalmanutha. He was obviously seeking to remain unrecognized. This, however, was not everywhere possible. His presence near Dalmanutha became known and Pharisees came *forth*—perhaps from this town¹—and asked of him a divine sign.² What the sign was to be *for*, what it was to prove, the reader is left to judge from the general situation. This situation suggests that they wanted credentials, supernatural and unmistakable credentials, for his appearance as a teacher and a doer of mighty works in Israel. Jesus recognized that in making this request these Pharisees were typical representatives of their entire generation. To him, however, their spirit was alien: he had rejected a course that relied on “signs” as a temptation of Satan,³ and therefore on this occasion also his answer was a negative.

This chance encounter with the Pharisees occasioned a remark by Jesus to the Twelve, as they were withdrawing by boat toward some haven unknown to us, which throws some light on the extreme seriousness of the situation. “Take heed,” he said, “and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees.”⁴ The disciples thought, at the time, that he was warning them against buying bread of the Pharisees,⁵ and Luke interpreted the “leaven” as an allusion to Pharisaic hypocrisy.⁶ We can hardly suppose, however, that the Twelve needed to be solemnly warned against hypocrisy at this time when they were bravely sharing the fortunes of Jesus as semi-fugitives from their own land. But while there is no indication that they were hypocrites, they certainly were sharers of the popular Messianic expectations, and the positive refusal of Jesus to satisfy the Pharisees’ desire for a divine sign may well have started some questioning in their hearts. The fact

¹ The word ἐξῆλθον may refer to a coming forth from Jerusalem, or from the land on the west of the Jordan. The reference is uncertain.

² Mk. 8:11; Mt. 16:1.

³ Mt. 4:3-11; Lk. 4:3-13.

⁴ Mk. 8:15; Mt. 16:6; Lk. 12:1.

⁵ Mk. 8:16; Mt. 16:7.

⁶ Lk. 12:1.

that Jesus warned them is evidence that he regarded them, or some of them at least, as liable to be swept away from their attachment to him by reason of his attitude toward the popular views.

Thus one thing after another was arising to darken the way before Jesus—the complete interruption of his teaching by the irresistible rush to get healed, the rejection in Nazareth, the increasing hostility of the religious leaders, and finally a doubt regarding the steadfastness of the chosen band.

From the unknown “parts of Dalmanutha” the little company went north and came to Bethsaida, for the story of Mark 8:22-26, though not adopted by the later Gospels, perfectly suits the place where he puts it, and accords with the present attitude of Jesus toward the subject of healing. On reaching Bethsaida he was recognized, and a blind man was brought to him for healing. As in the case of the deaf man on the east side of the lake farther south, so Jesus now takes the blind man apart, leading him out of the village.¹ He makes use of physical means in the process of healing, putting spittle on the eyes—a well known remedy for certain kinds of ophthalmia.² The man is restored, but only by degrees, for at first, men appear to him like walking trees, and only after a second laying on of Jesus’ hands does he see clearly.³ Here we observe an unwillingness to work a public cure, and, what is equally significant, the cure is gradual. To keep the affair as quiet as possible the man, who did not live in Bethsaida, was sent home directly, without returning to the town.

In keeping with his movements in the past weeks Jesus, failing to find in the lake region the wished-for quiet and relief from the demand for physical cures, withdrew again to the north, this time to the region about Caesarea Philippi, about a day’s journey from Bethsaida.⁴ He appears not to have entered Caesarea Philippi itself—Philip’s handsome capital—but went to various villages in the vicinity. How long he remained in this region

¹ Mk. 8:23.

² Mk. 8:23.

³ Mk. 8:24-25.

⁴ Mk. 8:27; Mt. 16:13; Lk. 9:18.

does not appear. He seems to have been little known here, and not until the close of his stay do we hear of a request for healing.¹ This was made, in the first instance, to his disciples, not to him, but they were unable to cast out the demon from the epileptic boy.² The treatment of the case by Jesus is noteworthy because of what he said in regard to faith. When confronted with his disciples' failure, he spoke, apparently with deep feeling, of the unbelief of that generation.³ Then, before taking the boy in hand, he awakened trust in the father's heart,⁴ and finally, in the private conversation with his disciples, he attributed their failure to lack of faith.⁵ Thus it is plain that in his thought these cures called for faith both in the healer and his patient, or, as in this case, in some one who represented the patient.

This stay in the region of Caesarea Philippi was not devoted by Jesus to his disciples exclusively.⁶ It seems that he preached to others, and was uninterrupted by calls for the healing of disease, that is, until the instance which has just been considered.

And yet the great event of these days was not his preaching of the kingdom of God and the possible winning of new disciples: it was that which took place within the circle of the Twelve. Now for the first time a disciple called him "Christ," and he not only did not check this utterance but rather sought it. Yet not for his own glory did he seek it, nor as a first step toward the realization of the disciples' dream of a Messianic kingdom. He sought it that he and his apostles might be bound the more closely together for the dark days which he knew were approaching. It must have been indelibly impressed upon the memory of the disciples that immediately after this acceptance by Jesus of the great title of hope, the title "Messiah," he announced his death.⁷ Thus the darkest, most bewildering problem of

¹ Mk. 9:14; Mt. 17:14; Lk. 9:37.

² Mk. 9:18; Mt. 17:16; Lk. 9:40.

³ Mk. 9:19; Mt. 17:17; Lk. 9:41.

⁴ Mk. 9:21-24.

⁵ Mk. 9:28-29; Mt. 17:19-20.

⁶ Mk. 8:34; Lk. 9:23.

⁷ Mk. 8:31; Mt. 16:21; Lk. 9:22.

their new life followed closely on the hour that may well have been to them the gladdest of all hours since they had come to know Jesus.¹

We have now traced the course of Jesus from his first preaching in Capernaum up to the days at Caesarea Philippi. We see him here surrounded by a little band of men, some of whom at least believed him to be their Messiah, and all of whom, with the possible exception of Judas, must have been personally attached to him. Abroad in the land where he has worked men hold concerning him widely divergent views, some honorable, some dishonorable. He is a prophet, or Elijah, or John the Baptist, to some; to others, a glutton and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners, who works cures by the aid of Beelzebub. Some of the seed of his preaching has fallen on good ground, others have fallen by the wayside, or on rocky soil, or among thorns. He has found in his own experience that the kingdom of God is as a grain of mustard seed and as a net that encloses at the same time both bad fish and good. He has found also that it is a difficult thing to lead men up into the quiet place of sonship to God. Yet he has attached a few men closely to himself, and in this fact lies his hope for the future.

¹ It is remarkable that the single tradition of Matthew and that of Luke add practically nothing to this sketch which is based on the *Logia* and the common synoptic tradition. Mt. 10:5 is obviously spoken from the standpoint of later times. Lk. 8:1-3 may well be regarded as historical.

CHAPTER VIII

THE PUBLIC CAREER: FROM CAESAREA PHILIPPI TO THE TRIUMPHAL ENTRY

THE problems of the career of Jesus increase as we pass on from the critical days spent at Caesarea Philippi. It has already been pointed out that the confession of faith in Jesus as the Messiah was immediately followed by his announcement of the suffering which he saw awaiting him. It is to be noticed now that it was also soon followed by his final departure from Galilee, where, according to the oldest sources, he had spent all the time since his return from the Jordan and the wilderness. Journeying as quietly as possible he came down from the mountains, where his heart had experienced a new and deep joy,¹ and passing through Galilee he stopped at Capernaum.² On the way thither he told his disciples that the Son of Man was to be delivered into the hands of men³—the same ominous word that he had uttered first before leaving the region of Caesarea Philippi. Yet it is said that they understood it not, and were afraid to ask him about it.⁴ They must have had at least a vague understanding of the word or they would not have feared to ask for an explanation. They must have felt that it meant some great suffering—a fact they could not harmonize with Messiahship.

Matthew and Luke abbreviate Mark's version of the words of Jesus and by so doing make it more difficult to understand the bewilderment of the disciples. They have only the statement that the Son of Man is to be delivered into the hands of men: Mark has the announcement of

¹ It seems to me not unlikely that Mt. 11:25-27 was spoken at the time of Peter's confession.

² Mk. 9:33; Mt. 17:24.

³ Mk. 9:31; Mt. 17:22; Lk. 9:44.

⁴ Mk. 9:32; Lk. 9:45.

death, and of a "rising" after three days.¹ This latter word may well have been the most unintelligible of all, while the word about "death" must have filled them with foreboding and with an unwillingness to probe the subject further.

Arrived in Capernaum and lodging perhaps in Peter's house, two incidents of recent occurrence were made the subject of remark by Jesus. First, there had been a dispute among the Twelve as to their relative greatness.² The point is left vague in the text, but may be somewhat defined from the general situation. Jesus had recently acknowledged his Messiahship to them, and if they were disputing as to who of them was greatest, the probability is that they were thinking of the future, of some sort of outward Messianic kingdom and of their relative rank in that. How they harmonized such a thought with the repeated word of Jesus in regard to his approaching death does not appear.

This thoroughly human dispute gave Jesus the text for a personal talk to the Twelve, the principle and illustration of which were not forgotten. The principle was that humility is the way to greatness, and the living illustration was a little child.³ Embracing the child and setting it in the midst of the Twelve were symbolic acts of obvious significance.

The second incident⁴—that of an unknown man who cast out demons independently of the apostles—may with most probability be located in the vicinity of Capernaum, for there Jesus was best known. It is highly suggestive in its bearing on the cures wrought by Jesus. Here was a man who by using the name of Jesus cured people who were supposed to be possessed by demons. His success is unquestioned. Apparently he had taken up this merciful work entirely on his own responsibility. Jesus inferred from the man's deeds that he was his friend, and that he would not quickly speak evil of him.⁵ The fact

¹ Mk. 9:31.

² Mk. 9:34; Lk. 9:46.—Matthew's transformation of the question (18:1) may have been occasioned by a desire to spare the apostles.

³ Mk. 9:35-37; Mt. 18:25; Lk. 9:47-48.

⁴ Mk. 9:38-41; Lk. 9:49-50.

⁵ Mk. 9:39.

of the man's success is striking proof of the profound impression made by Jesus as a healer. It also clearly shows that miraculous power was not needed in order that one might cast out demons. According to the oldest Gospel¹ Jesus added a severe warning against that pure formalism which was manifest in the apostles' attempt to suppress this unknown worker. One might better be cast into the lake, he said, with a great stone fastened about the neck, than cause "one of these little ones" to stumble, that is, in the present instance, to stop casting out demons in the name of Jesus. The severity of this language is justified when one considers that this spirit which his own apostles had exhibited was the very antipodes of that spirit which it was his sole purpose in life to implant in the hearts of men. If the words of Mk. 9:43, 45, 47 were also spoken at this time, then Jesus gave still greater emphasis to his warning by dwelling on the value of *loyalty* to him—for so we interpret the words about *not* stumbling. Here we touch on that consciousness of being the supreme revealer of God which was discussed in an earlier chapter.

With this warning to his disciples, more severe in tone than any word of Jesus thus far considered, may be associated that utterance of the *Logia* concerning the Galilean cities where he had labored.² Unmistakably does this indicate that these cities were, as a whole, untouched by the preaching of Jesus. Of Capernaum we know that it had been moved by his mighty works, but moved only to an eager desire to see and experience more of them. The present passage is most significant because it is the first word of Jesus that indicates what he had hoped from his works of healing. If such works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented in sackcloth and ashes. Jesus makes no mention here of his preaching: the works alone would have wrought repentance. It is not clear whether the preaching, which was always in the foreground of Jesus' min-

¹ Mk. 9:42.—In Mt. 18:6 the "little ones" are the class represented by the child, but this connection affords no explanation of the word "stumble."

² Mt. 11:20-24; Lk. 10:13-16.

istry, is here taken for granted as working together with the deeds of healing. If it is not, we must ask *why* Jesus thought that his mighty works ought to have led men to repentance. But to this question the narrative gives no answer. We may suppose that, since Jesus looked upon his mighty works as wrought by the power of God through him, he felt that they ought to have made men sensible of the presence of God, and so have made them turn from their sins; but it is equally possible to hold that, in his thought, the *kindness* which was manifested in these acts of healing ought to have been a motive strong enough to turn men unto God. In any event we have here a confession of Jesus that, as regards these cities at least, his ministry of healing had failed to accomplish what he had hoped from it.

That ministry, as well as the ministry of preaching, was now ended as far as Galilee was concerned. There is no certain, or even valuable, clue, in the oldest Gospel as to how long it had continued. The circumstance that the narrative up to this point contains no allusion to the occurrence of a Passover may indeed favor the view that none had occurred since Jesus returned to Capernaum.

In the single tradition of Matthew there is a reference to the collection of the temple tax,¹ and that event is located about the time of Jesus' final departure from Galilee. If we assume that in the days of Jesus the temple tax was collected in Palestine shortly before the Passover, as was done in later centuries, according to the Talmud, this passage would obviously help to fix the time when Jesus left Galilee, but this assumption is of a somewhat doubtful character. One other consideration should be noted as having a bearing on the length of the ministry of Jesus in Galilee, viz. the radical opposition between him and the religious authorities. Even though his work was in the northern province, at a distance from the theological center, it is not probable that the hierarchy would *long* tolerate so powerful and dangerous an enemy.

Taken together these points, while *proving* nothing,

¹ Mt. 17:24-27.

may be allowed to *favor* the view that the Passover which was drawing near when Jesus left Galilee forever was the first since his public ministry began.

When Jesus left Capernaum, whither he had come from Caesarea Philippi, he set his face to go to Jerusalem, and the journey was a memorable one. According to the oldest narrative he went through Perea,¹ the longer route to the capital, but Luke in a passage which bears the evident stamp of trustworthiness says that he started by the short Samaritan route.² He does not indeed speak at all of the Perean way, but neither does his narrative *exclude* the possibility that Jesus, being repulsed in Samaria, altered his course and crossed the Jordan into Perea. He no less than Mark lets Jesus go up to Jerusalem from Jericho,³ which implies that he had come down the Jordan valley.

The story of being repulsed in a Samaritan village brings out the deep, sad contrast between the spirit of the apostles and the spirit of Jesus. James and John, zealous for the honor of a Master whom they believed to be the Messiah, suggested destroying the village by calling down fire from heaven, for which act they might have pleaded an Old Testament precedent.⁴ And this proposition was submitted by two of the four disciples who had been longest with Jesus! It may have been hard for Jesus to hear that he could not find lodging in the Samaritan village, but certainly it was not so hard as to hear this suggestion of vengeance from his intimate friends. He could lodge indeed under God's open sky, but when should he succeed in begetting a new spirit in these men! Thus unpropitiously did the journey toward Jerusalem begin.

The next scene is in Perea, but in what town or locality we are not told. No place is mentioned by name until they cross back to the west side and come to Jericho.⁵ But the journey through Perea was not without incident. That it was a leisurely journey, extending through a number of days if not weeks, is implied in Mark's state-

¹ Mk. 10:1.

² Lk. 9:51-56.

³ Lk. 18:35; 19:1.

⁴ 2 Kings 1:10-12.

⁵ Mk. 10:46.

ment that crowds gathered and that Jesus taught them.¹ For the first time in his ministry when he met and taught crowds of people there is no reference to mighty works.² Doubtless there were sick people in Perea in the villages through which Jesus passed, and doubtless they would have been glad to be healed. Since, however, the oldest narrative, which gives prominence to the healing ministry of Jesus, knows of no cure on this Perean journey, we have to conclude that his aversion to healing, which has been noticed from the close of the longer stay in Capernaum, still continued.

Three or four incidents, according to the oldest narrative, marked this journey through Perea. First, there was the question about divorce,³ which concerns us here only as showing that the critics of Jesus were on the watch, hoping, in this instance, to discredit him with the people, possibly also with Herod Antipas. The popular view regarding divorce was extremely lax. Antipas had arrested the Baptist because he condemned his marriage with Herodias, and the enemies of Jesus, apprehending that he would severely condemn the lax view, may have hoped to involve him in trouble with the ruler of Perea, or, at least, to have hurt his reputation with the multitude.

The second incident—that of bringing to him little children⁴—also had a most discouraging side, though, unlike the first, it was not altogether disappointing. That there were people who desired his blessing for their little ones was, in these dark days, a bit of glad sunshine—an evidence that some fathers and mothers thought him a good and kindly man if nothing more. But here again, among his apostles, was manifest a lack of sympathy with him and with the Gospel, which moved him with deep displeasure.⁵ For they would have stayed the parents from bringing their children to Jesus—for what

¹ Mk. 10:1.

² Mt. 19:2 is intrinsically less probable than the older source.

³ Mk. 10:2-12; Mt. 19:3-4, 7-8; Lk. 16:18.

⁴ Mk. 10:13-16; Mt. 19:13-15; Lk. 18:15-17.

⁵ Matthew and Luke drop this feature of the oldest Gospel, perhaps thinking that it marred the picture of a divine Saviour's dignity.

reason we are not told. How far they were from his view of the matter is clear from his declaration that the kingdom of heaven—and therefore any service that he could render—belonged to just such persons as these children.

The third Perean incident in the common synoptic tradition is that of an upright rich man who wanted to know what he should do to make sure of eternal life.¹ There was a frankness and earnestness about the man who had kept the commandments from his youth that deeply impressed Jesus, and he would fain have had him as a disciple, but only on the condition that he was ready to give up everything for his sake. That was too high a doctrine for the man, and he went away with downcast countenance. Commenting on the incident—which may not have been the only one of its kind in his experience—Jesus amazed his disciples by his strong language, saying that it was easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God. To their wondering exclamation "And who can be saved!" he replied in substance that no one (i.e., of the rich) could be saved without the aid of the Almighty.

This incident was naturally discouraging, and possibly there was something in the look or tone of Jesus which led Peter to speak his word of comfort—"Behold we have left all and followed thee."² The general purport of the response of Jesus to this word of Peter is clear: one who leaves all for his sake shall receive much more than he leaves. According to Mark, he shall receive an hundred-fold in kind for that which he is obliged to give up but *with persecutions*—a clause which suggests that all the details preceding—houses, brothers, sisters, mothers, children, and fields—are not only to be understood figuratively, but also as a figurative expression of *spiritual goods*. This is the great reward for the present time, and that in the coming age is eternal life.

Another incident which the synoptists put before the

¹ Mk. 10:17-27; Mt. 19:16-26; Lk. 18:18-23.

² Mk. 10:28; Mt. 19:27; Lk. 18:28.—Matthew's addition "what then shall we have?" is unnecessarily hard on Peter.

arrival of Jesus at Jericho, and therefore presumably in the Perean days, is a repetition of the announcement of his approaching death,¹ made first in the region of Caesarea Philippi and again before Jesus with the Twelve reached Capernaum. According to the dramatic representation of the oldest source Jesus on a certain occasion was walking in advance of his apostles; they were *amazed*, apparently because he did this; others who were following were afraid, whether for their own safety or, more probably, for his, does not appear.² Now this state of things implies that something unusual had taken place. We may perhaps explain the order of the little cavalcade and the aroused feelings of those who followed Jesus by supposing that the incident of Lk. 13: 31-33 had just occurred, or that the ominous word about the accomplishment of his "baptism" had just been spoken.³ But whatever the occasion may have been, the scene is suggestive, and the account can hardly have arisen except from the words of a participant. Jesus goes in advance as though "straitened" until his baptism should be accomplished; the Twelve are amazed, and others, presumably friendly to him if not outspoken disciples, are afraid. Jesus takes the Twelve apart, and tells them what is to befall the Son of Man in Jerusalem. The thought that is uppermost in his mind appears to be that they shall fully know what they are about to face. Yet it seems doubtful whether they understood his words any more deeply and truly than on the former occasions when he had said something of the same sort. For James and John, when they got opportunity, asked for the first seats in his *glory*,⁴ as though the intervening events were of slightest moment. Not so in the thought of Jesus. These events were rather the indispensable stepping-stones to that "glory," and could these forward disciples, who already contemplated the first seats in his kingdom, *share* these events at his side? Their answer showed how little they appreciated what he had said.

¹ Mk. 10:32-34; Mt. 20:17-19; Lk. 18:31-34.

² Mk. 10:32.

³ Lk. 12:49-50.

⁴ Mk. 10:35-40; Mt. 20:20-23.

Then he told them that their request went beyond his authority. He could indeed assure them of suffering, but not of the rank they would attain in the kingdom of God.

One discouragement followed swiftly upon another in these days. The ambition of the two aroused the indignation of the remaining ten, and Jesus saw the veritable spirit of the world in the men in whom he had long striven to create the spirit of the kingdom.¹ Once more therefore he told them what a difference lay between them as his disciples and the world, and illustrated the familiar principle from the event that was now constantly in view.²

Thus far we have followed the common synoptic tradition, with the addition of a single detail from Luke. But Luke has other material peculiar to himself which may not improbably belong in these Perea days when Jesus was slowly journeying toward Jerusalem. Such is the incident of a man who volunteered to follow Jesus, but who wished first to bid farewell to his family.³ The Master regarded this request as a sign of divided affection, and said, "No man, having put his hand to the plough and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God." Again, to this period may well be assigned that dark and threatening word of Jesus about a mission to cast fire on the earth and about a baptism which he had to meet.⁴ Not that the fire of conflict was now first kindled, for that indeed was not the case, but the *heat* of the conflict was now at hand. Or, to change the figure, the "baptism" which he had to undergo—doubtless a symbol of the dark days which he foresaw—was felt to be near, and he was "straitened" until it should be accomplished; he would that it were past. This desire is perhaps to be understood in connection with a word in his message to Herod, which may have been spoken at about the same time. Certain Pharisees are said to have notified Jesus of Herod's desire to kill him and to have advised him to

¹ Mk. 10:41; Mt. 20:24; Lk. 22:24.

² Mk. 10:42-45; Mt. 20:25-28; Lk. 22:25-27.

³ Lk. 9:61-62.

⁴ Lk. 12:49-50.

flee out of Herod's territory.¹ The reply of Jesus was ostensibly for Herod, but was fraught with definite information for the Pharisees also, if they too, as well as Herod, had sinister thoughts and designs against him: "Go and say to that fox, Behold, I cast out demons and perform cures today and tomorrow, and the third day I am *perfected*."² This word is obscure, but if it contains the thought that his death was to *crown* his ministry, then it throws a light back upon that other saying about a *baptism* which he wished were past. In that light this word does not indicate impatience to be beyond the reach of his foes, where the wicked cease from troubling, but rather a longing to have his mission become more effective.

It is obvious that this message to Herod reflects a conviction of Jesus that his end was very near. The "third day" I am perfected, that is, in the immediate future. But neither this conviction of the nearness of his death, nor the belief that it would be in Jerusalem, suggests supernatural prevision. One had but to know the temper of the hierarchy and to have observed the meaning of recent events to feel that a visit to Jerusalem would end the career of Jesus. And surely Jesus knew, as no one else did, the spirit of the religious leaders, and he read the signs of the times with unparalleled insight.

Thus with multiplying omens of evil days Jesus with the Twelve came to Jericho, to the beginning of the last stage of their journey.³

Here two memorable events occurred, for the story of Lk. 19:1-10 may, in point of historical value, be set by the side of that which the oldest Gospel locates at Jericho. For the first time in days or weeks Jesus performed a cure, restoring sight to a blind beggar,⁴ who had evidently heard of him as a healer and who was not to be cheated out of his one chance to get help. The incident is notable

¹ Lk. 13:31.

² Lk. 13:32.

³ Mk. 10:46; Mt. 20:29; Lk. 18:35.

⁴ Mk. 10:46-52; Mt. 20:29-34; Lk. 18:35-43.

as the single instance in the oldest Gospel¹ where Jesus was addressed as "Son of David." If this be regarded as historical, we must assume that the rumor of Jesus' mighty works had come to this man's knowledge and that he—a rare exception in his generation—drew the inference that Jesus was the Messiah. The reply of Jesus took no account of this particular character of the man's faith, for he said to him, as he had to others whose confidence in him was simply confidence that he was able to help, "Thy faith hath saved thee."

The second incident—that of Zacchaeus—justified the reputation of Jesus as a friend of publicans, for this man was a chief publican, perhaps because located at this border-city, which was also a center of the balsam trade and of other semi-tropical products of the Jordan valley. The reputation which Jesus had for friendliness toward publicans, possibly also a knowledge of the circumstance that one of his chosen apostles was a publican, was sufficient reason why Zacchaeus was willing to expose himself to ridicule by climbing into a tree by the road in order to see the famous rabbi. The remarkable insight of Jesus and his swiftness of decision are strikingly illustrated in his words to Zacchaeus. The name and calling of the man he may have learned from those about him as he passed along, but that this tax-gatherer up in the tree would be a glad host for him and probably also for his apostles, and that this was the desirable arrangement to make for the night—these were the intuitive conclusions of the moment. The fact of a general murmur at this very democratic step of Jesus may best be regarded as springing out of the popular dislike of Zacchaeus, not as an indication that people, being proud of Jesus, were unwilling that he should be contaminated by contact with one who was regarded as no better than a robber.

The effect of the friendliness of Jesus toward Zacchaeus and, as we may suppose, of gracious words about the kingdom of God, was that the publican at once turned a new page and formed a resolve which led Jesus to say confidently that salvation had come to his house. This

¹ There is a single instance in the *Logia* (Mt. 12:23; Lk. 11:14).

was one of the few incidents belonging to these days which were fitted to encourage Jesus, and to sustain his confidence in the ultimate triumph of his mission.

There is in Luke a hint of suppressed excitement as the company of Galileans climbed the steep road from Jericho to Jerusalem, for on this journey he puts the parable of the Pounds,¹ which was spoken, he thought, to counteract the belief entertained by those who were with Jesus that the kingdom of God was immediately to appear. The thought of Luke has in its favor those two passages belonging to recent days which represent the apostles as eagerly considering who were to have the first places in the kingdom. This eagerness is best explained if they thought that, notwithstanding what Jesus had said of his approaching death, the kingdom was to be inaugurated when he should reach Jerusalem.²

With the arrival at Bethany a few days before the last act of the public career of Jesus we come to a remarkable expansion and fulness of our sources. About one-third of the oldest Gospel is devoted to an account of the short interval between the arrival in Bethany and the morning of the execution—a period of which the *Logia* has no clear trace whatsoever. This sudden broadening of the early tradition, due in part, we may suppose, to the fact that the last words and acts of a great leader naturally impress themselves most deeply on the minds of his followers, and in part to the fact that the Apostolic Church ascribed fundamental importance to the death of Jesus, is not without certain interesting chronological marks, which are clearest and most consistent in the oldest Gospel. Of no other period in the life of Jesus can anything at all approaching a diary be constructed; but even here, where we seem to be able to trace his movements from day to day, we must be on our guard against too great positiveness.

A brief survey of these chronological hints may fitly precede the final portion of our narrative.

¹ Lk. 19:11-28.

² They may reasonably have found support for their belief in the words spoken at Caesarea Philippi, Mk. 9:1.

The evening of the day of the triumphal entry into Jerusalem found Jesus again in Bethany.¹ The following nights were spent without the city, but Mark does not say that Jesus came again to Bethany until 14:3. The statement of Luke that Jesus lodged on the Mount of Olives,² presumably in the open air, may be regarded as simply a more definite description than Mark's statement³ that he was in the habit of going forth out of the city. The morning of the *second* day after the entry is specified⁴ and the subsequent visit to the temple,⁵ which was "two days" before the Passover.⁶ Now as Jesus was put to death on the day before the Sabbath,⁷ i.e., on Friday, the observance of the Passover must have fallen on Thursday evening. *Probably* the expression "two days before the Passover" takes us back to Tuesday, in which case the first day after the entry was Monday and the entry itself on Sunday.

Adopting this chronological outline as the only one that makes serious claims of trustworthiness, we must conclude that the Sabbath was spent in Jericho, probably in the home of Zacchaeus—a fact which would help to account for Bartimaeus' knowledge of Jesus and which would also render the transformation of Zacchaeus more intelligible. If the pilgrims set out for Jerusalem in the early morning and rested during the heat of the day, the entry into Jerusalem would have fallen in the late afternoon, as Mark implies.⁸

This entry amid cheering crowds who hailed Jesus as coming in the Lord's name and hailed the coming kingdom of David—all so different from the absolute public reserve of Jesus hitherto, in regard to his Messiahship—how is it to be judged according to the oldest sources?

In the first place, it is to be regarded not as a formal plan but as a momentary inspiration. That Jesus purposed to make a public assertion, in Jerusalem, of his claim to be the Messiah, save as he had already done else-

¹ Mk. 11:11.

² Lk. 21:37.

³ Mk. 11:19.

⁴ Mk. 11:20.

⁵ Mk. 11:27.

⁶ Mk. 14:2.

⁷ Mk. 15:42.

⁸ Mk. 11:11.

where by his divine sympathy and by his teaching of the kingdom of God, cannot be affirmed.

The incident of the ass bears the stamp of unpremeditatedness. The whole thing was arranged on the spur of the moment. Jesus sent two disciples to a near village¹ where an ass was tied in the open street.² They were to say to the owner, "The Master has need of it, and straightway he will return it."³ The probability is that Jesus had seen the ass⁴ shortly before, as they had left one of the villages through which they passed, and then, possibly as he reflected on Zech. 9:9 and perhaps at the same time saw throngs coming forth to meet him,⁵ suddenly resolved to send for it and to ride into the city. But this mode of entry was hardly the same as a Messianic declaration: it was rather a living parable, yet one whose meaning would be caught by few if by any. No doubt those who cried "Hosanna" and who spoke of the coming Davidic Kingdom were filled with the idea that Jesus was about to do some wonderful thing and inaugurate the wished-for Messianic reign. Nor was it the wish of Jesus that they should be silent. It was high time that he should be publicly recognized. Were all men now to hold their peace, after what they had seen and heard in the past months, the very stones would cry out.⁶

Public recognition, yes, but let there be due heed to his claims. This entry does not suggest a changed conception of Messiahship in Jesus' mind. It is peaceful, not martial. The disciples have boughs in their hands, not bows and spears. The Master does not own even the humble beast that he rides, but has borrowed it for the occasion. The people who are shouting are a small company of Galileans: they are not the rich and mighty

¹ Mk. 11:2.

² Mk. 11:4.

³ Mk. 11:3.—The promise to return the ass is omitted in Matthew and Luke. In Matthew (21:3) its place is taken by words which refer not to Jesus but to the owner of the ass. Both the omission and the substitute may be explained as due to a tendency to heighten the glory of Jesus.

⁴ Matthew's version of this incident, according to which Jesus sent for two beasts and sat on them (ἐπάνω αὐτῶν), was doubtless due to a misunderstanding of the Hebrew parallelism in Zech. 9:9.

⁵ Consider the οἱ ποάγοντες in Mk. 11:9, and Jn. 12:12-13.

⁶ Lk. 19:39-40.

of the land. Indeed, the scene is the very antipodes of that which the popular imagination would have painted as the fitting entry of the Messiah into the city of David.¹

As an outward and spectacular expression of Jesus' thought of himself it was justified by its exceeding simplicity, and justified further by its being a realization of a Messianic passage in the Old Testament. It was especially fitting, if, as the synoptic record teaches, this was the first time Jesus had come to Jerusalem since the beginning of his public ministry.²

What became of the singular cavalcade when it reached the temple we do not know, or how Jesus separated himself from the jubilant Galilean throng. That he "looked around" on everything in the sanctuary, as the oldest Gospel informs us,³ is quite in accord with the view that this was his first appearance there since his public career began, and also becomes fraught with peculiar meaning in view of what transpired on the next day. After this significant survey of the state of things in the temple Jesus went forth from the city, and returned to Bethany.

¹ How much of the passage Lk. 19:41-44 can be regarded as historical it is difficult to say. The minute description of vs. 43-44 is without support in the other sayings of Jesus regarding the future, and was probably written with the siege and fall of the city in mind. Vs. 42 may have been spoken by Jesus, but hardly at this time.

² Mt. 21:10-11 implies that Jesus was unknown by face in Jerusalem.

³ Mk. 11:11.

CHAPTER IX

THE PUBLIC CAREER: FROM THE TRIUMPHAL ENTRY TO GOLGOTHA

THE day after the entry into Jerusalem was eventful. There was, first, the incident of the fruitless fig-tree¹—evidently somewhat obscure to the disciples at the time,² and still obscure. How did it happen that Jesus was hungry in the morning, just after leaving his friends in Bethany? Did his disciples *know* that he was hungry except as they inferred it from his coming to the fig-tree? But could they be sure that his motive in approaching the fig-tree—one that had leaves at this season—was to get food? These questions assume new importance in view of the improbability that Jesus, *simply* because he was disappointed in his search for figs to satisfy hunger, would have consigned a tree to perpetual barrenness. One is fully justified in regarding this as extremely improbable in view of the entire picture of the character of Jesus which the Gospels give us. The conviction that we have but a fragmentary and inadequate account of the incident is heightened by the fact that while in Mark the withering of the tree was not noticed until the following morning,³ in Matthew it took place *immediately*, to the great wonder of the disciples.⁴ We are therefore forced to the conclusion that no safe judgment can be formed of the historical incident back of the narrative.

But the great event of the day took place in the temple. What Jesus had observed the previous evening—the encroachment of business, and dishonestly conducted business at that, upon the sacredness of the house of God—

¹ Mk. 11:12-14; Mt. 21:18-19.

² Mk. 11:13c; Mt. 21:20. Possibly Luke omitted the incident because it was obscure.

³ Mk. 11:21.

⁴ Mt. 21:20.

led to the decision of a forcible interference with the traffic that was being carried on there. This was a bold course, fraught with the utmost peril to himself, yet a course which he knew would be approved by the moral sense of the average man. How it was carried out, whether single-handed or with the aid of the Twelve and others, we are not told. To understand how it was possible that a Galilean teacher could set at nought the temple police, and overthrow the established order of the holy place, one must remember the reputation that had preceded his coming to Jerusalem, and, still more important, remember the almost irresistible power which inheres in human personality when there is an absolute conviction of God's presence and aid. It was with a crushing quotation of Scripture that Jesus laid violent hands on the desecrating traffic.¹

We can only conjecture what Jesus hoped to accomplish by this violent overturning of temple practices. It may indeed be that he had no thought of ultimate consequences, that he did the deed simply because he saw that it ought to be done, and because he felt in himself the power to do it. There was nothing distinctively Messianic in the act: any prophet might have attempted it and, conceivably, might have accomplished it; at the same time, however, it was an assertion by Jesus of a religious authority superior to that of the actual leaders of religion. It was therefore an act which must inevitably focus public attention upon him. Clearly too it was an act which the priests and scribes could not forgive. That from this hour they sought how they might destroy him, as the oldest Gospel reports,² we cannot doubt. To this manifest hostility may be attributed the circumstance that Jesus is not said to have gone to *Bethany* that night, where he might have been seized, but simply to have gone forth out of the city.³

The next day (Tuesday?) was spent largely in the courts of the temple, and must have added to the prestige of Jesus with the multitude no less than to the bitterness

¹ Mk. 11:17; Mt. 21:13; Lk. 19:46.

² Mk. 11:18; Lk. 19:47-48.

³ Mk. 11:19.

of the leaders against him. His brave act in cleansing the temple insured him an eager audience, and made it unwise for the authorities to attempt to seize him while he was surrounded by listening crowds. But they could seek to embarrass him and to undermine the respect which was being shown him. This they accordingly did.

First, an imposing body of dignitaries challenged him to produce credentials that would justify his present course.¹ They knew well that he had no credentials of a technical sort—that he was not a rabbinically authorized teacher, and they may have hoped to weaken his influence by exposing this fact. But Jesus silenced them with a skillful counter question: "The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men?" Their hostile attitude toward John² did not allow them to say that his baptism was from heaven, and their fear of the multitude³ prevented their saying that his baptism was from men, as in their hearts they would have liked to do. In this dilemma they were forced to confess their ignorance—a fact which must at once have lowered their standing with the crowd and have raised that of Jesus.

The parable of the Unfaithful Vinedressers⁴ is represented as having been spoken on this day, and this setting appears to be most suitable. Indeed, this parable may be regarded as a virtual reply to the question concerning Jesus' authority. If the vinedressers were intended to represent the religious authorities in Israel—the same who had just challenged him to produce his credentials—then Jesus corresponded to the "son," and accordingly the justification of his course was the fact that he had been sent by God for this very work. In picturing the son of the householder as killed and cast out of the vineyard Jesus gave indirect expression to his sense of the certainty and immediacy of his own death; and the declaration that the Lord of the vineyard would destroy the unfaithful vinedressers, and would give the vineyard to others, reflects a conviction of the hopelessness of the spiritual condition of the religious leaders.

¹ Mk. 11:27-28; Mt. 21:23; Lk. 20:1-2.

² Mt. 3:7; 21:32.

³ Mk. 11:32.

⁴ Mk. 12:12; Mt. 21:33-46; Lk. 20:9-19.

Thus this parable of the Unfaithful Vinedressers was a much more severe arraignment of the authorities of the temple than had been involved in the reformatory act of the preceding day. Only their fear of the people restrained them from seizing Jesus on the spot.¹

How intense the hatred of the authorities was appears in the fact that the next scheme to entangle Jesus was carried out jointly by Pharisees and Herodians—parties that were to be blended only by some overwhelming common danger.² The aim of these men was to get a yes or a no from Jesus to the question whether it was lawful to pay tribute to Caesar.³ With either answer they hoped to gain an advantage over him. If he said yes, the Pharisees might call him a traitor to Israel; and if he said no, the Herodians could accuse him to the Governor as disloyal. But Jesus saw through their clever plan, and, calling for a *denarius*, he asked whose the image and superscription were. They must acknowledge that they were Caesar's. Then at length he answered their question, but evaded their plot. For while his answer was in line with Herodian policy, so that this party had no argument against him, it also thwarted the Pharisees, for it conceded the sovereignty of God, though in a sphere distinct from Caesar's. They have two Masters, he said in substance, but *not in the same sphere*; hence they can serve both.

Then there came Sadducees who sought to get the better of Jesus in a discussion regarding the doctrine of resurrection.⁴ They must have known that on this subject he shared the view of the Pharisees. So they laid before him the case of a woman who had had seven legal husbands, and, assuming that if there were a life beyond the grave the same order of things must obtain in it as in the present, they asked to which of the seven she would belong in the resurrection. In their judgment, this case reduced the doctrine to an absurdity. For it would be contrary to the Mosaic law that she should be the wife

¹ Mk. 12:12; Mt. 21:46; Lk. 20:19.

² Mk. 12:13; Mt. 21:15.

³ Mk. 12:14; Mt. 22:17; Lk. 20:22.

⁴ Mk. 12:18-27; Mt. 22:23-33; Lk. 20:27-38.

of all the seven at the same time, and they assumed that she *must* belong to one of them.

In his reply, Jesus simply denied their premise. The old earthly relations are discontinued in the resurrection. People no longer marry nor are given in marriage, but they are as angels.

Jesus then goes on to show from Scripture that the belief in the immortality of man is grounded in God's relation to him. He refers them to Jehovah's words to Moses at the Bush: "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob."¹ He lays it down as a self-evident truth that the living God must be the God of living ones. If then God declares himself the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, it follows that they are alive, that death did not end their existence. To be the *God* of anyone, as of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, is, for Jesus, to sustain a relation to that one which is essentially eternal. The highest that heart can conceive, the fulfilment of its deep pure longings, is wrapt up for any one in the assertion of Jehovah, "I am his God." Thus the use of the passage in Exodus did not hinge on the present tense of the verb ("I *am* the God of Abraham"), but rather on the Divine relationship between these men and Jehovah.

This incident of Jesus' encounter with Sadducees is worthy of notice in a general sketch of his public career because it not only helps to show how universal was the opposition of the ruling classes toward him on his arrival in Jerusalem, but also illustrates the astonishing readiness and breadth of his interpretation of Scripture.

This latter point was further illustrated on the same occasion by Jesus' reply to one of the hair-splitting casuistical questions in which the scribes delighted, viz. which of the commandments—the Jews counted 613—was the greatest of all.² The man who asked this question, if we follow the oldest account which is intrinsically the most consistent,³ had no hostile intent, but, on the contrary, appears to have been in a receptive mood. Jesus

¹ Ex. 3:6.

² Mk. 12:28-37; Mt. 22:34-40, 46; Lk. 10:25-28; 20:40.

³ Lk. 10:25-28 credits a certain lawyer with the same comprehensive summary of Law and Prophets which Mark here ascribes to Jesus.

in his answer ignored even the Decalogue itself, and declared that the two great commandments were to love God supremely and to love one's neighbor as one's self. His answer had no savor of the rabbinical method of Scripture interpretation, but was given him by his own deepest experience of life.

In line with the cleansing of the temple and the parable of the Unfaithful Vinedressers was the denunciation of the scribes, which also, according to the oldest Gospel, belonged to the same eventful day with the preceding public controversies. This denunciation necessarily implies a depth and extent of popular interest in Jesus which was regarded by the adversaries as a most formidable barrier. The scribes were arraigned as proud, avaricious and hypocritical.¹ It will be noticed that nothing was said of their attitude toward *him*, and thus the denunciation is marked off from that which was directed against the Galilean cities. This feature of the words accords with the representation of the synoptic tradition that Jesus had not labored in Jerusalem prior to these last few days.

If the quiet scene of Mk. 12:41-44, Lk. 21:1-4 followed upon the severe denunciation of the scribes, or even occurred on the same day, it bears further evidence to the relative security which Jesus had won by his bold invasion of the temple and his victory over the religious authorities, and, at the same time, shows his astonishing power of self-control and self-forgetfulness. As the storm on the lake did not disturb his serenity, so the greater perils of the present hour were ignored. He observed the act of a poor widow who cast two mites into the treasury, he reflected upon it, then called his disciples and explained to them its significance; and he did these things with a composed and unperturbed mind, though all about him were powerful enemies who were bent on his immediate destruction.

As Jesus left the temple at the close of this memorable day a certain disciple—presumably a Galilean and there-

¹ Mk. 12:38-40; Mt. 23:1-7; Lk. 20:45-47.—Also, if certain words of the *Logia* were spoken on this occasion, they were arraigned as blind guides and as those who shut the kingdom of heaven against men (Mt. 23:13, 23-24; Lk. 11:52, 42).

fore one whom the glory of the great edifice filled with fresh wonder owing to the infrequency of his visits—remarked on its magnificence.¹ The response of Jesus to this word of admiration was on a different plane. Not the magnificence of the temple, but its destruction, was before his mind. "There shall not be left here one stone upon another, which shall not be thrown down."² A natural conclusion was this concerning a temple of God in which the Messiah himself, God's unique messenger, was not safe from assault.

Later, on the Mount of Olives, when perhaps the company of disciples had broken up for the night, the four men first called to discipleship asked Jesus privately to tell them when these things "were to be and what would be the sign of their accomplishment"³—questions that were more curious than important.⁴ The reply of Jesus did not gratify their curiosity—he said he was not able to do that⁵—but it was of a practical character. It is certain that the report of his words embodies *some* later material,⁶ but difficult to determine *how much*. For the present biographical purpose it is sufficient to note two salient features of his reply. In the first place, it is clear that he warned them to be on their guard, for a time of great tribulation was before them.⁷ They would be hated and persecuted⁸—a word spoken to them once before—but the Spirit of God would aid them in their sore need.⁹ Second, *after* this approaching tribulation¹⁰ but within the present generation,¹¹ the Son of Man would be seen coming on the clouds with power and great glory¹²—an event to be ushered in by the Old Testament signs of the "Day of Jehovah."¹³ Because this consum-

¹ Mk. 13:1; Mt. 24:1; Lk. 21:5.

² Mk. 13:2; Mt. 24:2; Lk. 21:6.

³ Peculiar to Matthew and doubtless secondary is the term *παρουσία* (24:3, 27, 37, 39).

⁴ Mk. 13:3-4; Mt. 24:4; Lk. 21:7.

⁵ Mk. 13:32; Mt. 24:36.

⁶ E.g., Mk. 13:14.

⁷ Mk. 13:5; Mt. 24:4; Lk. 21:8.

⁸ Mk. 13:9, 13; Mt. 24:9; Lk. 21:16-17.

⁹ Mk. 13:11; Lk. 21:15.

¹⁰ Mk. 13:24; Mt. 24:29.

¹¹ Mk. 13:30; Mt. 24:34; Lk. 21:32.

¹² Mk. 13:26; Mt. 24:30; Lk. 21:27.

¹³ Mk. 13:24-25; Mt. 24:29; Lk. 21:25.

mation was imminent and uncertain they and all disciples should "watch."¹ It seems therefore that, though Jesus disclaimed a knowledge of the *exact* time of these great occurrences of the future, he was convinced that they would fall within a generation, or, as he said on another occasion when speaking of the coming of the kingdom with power,² it would be while some of those present were still alive. Now history records the destruction of the temple some forty years after the death of Jesus (Sept. 70 A.D.), and a coming of the kingdom of God with power long before that time;³ but of a *subsequent* event or series of events, which yet lay within the distance of a life-time from the day when Jesus spoke and which could possibly be thought of as a fulfilment of the word about the Son of Man coming on the clouds with power and great glory, history has no record. We here face an unsolved problem. That Jesus shared the views of his people and age, sometimes erroneous views, as in the case of demoniac possession, is to be admitted. It is possible that he also held, in common with his age, that there was to be a consummation of the present order in the near future. But in this case as little as in the other do we confront a fact that in the slightest degree affects the essential claims of Jesus to be the revealer of the character of God.

With this last eventful day of public teaching the oldest Gospel associates yet two significant incidents—the anointing of Jesus in Bethany,⁴ and the enlistment of Judas in the service of the priests.⁵ The story of the anointing was apparently preserved because of the words of Jesus which it called forth. Hence it is not surprising

¹ Mk. 13:32-37; Mt. 24:42; 25:13-14; Lk. 21:36; 12:40.

² Mk. 9:1.

³ See the Book of Acts.

⁴ Mk. 14:3-9; Mt. 26:6-13.—Luke omits this incident, but gives, in an earlier connection, a somewhat similar one (7:36-50). Jesus is anointed by a woman in the house of a certain Simon, but all the other circumstances are different. Luke was probably acquainted with Mark 14:3-9, and may have omitted it because of its resemblance to the other story.—The account in Jn. 12:1-11 appears to be based on the oldest Gospel, but seriously modifies it. It drops Simon, and seems to put the incident in the home of Lazarus. It fills out the blanks left in the oldest Gospel, and relieves the other apostles of blame by casting it all upon Judas. These features point to its secondary character.

⁵ Mk. 14:10-11; Mt. 26:14-16; Lk. 22:3-6.

that only a meagre statement of the details of the event is given. Who the woman was who anointed the head of Jesus, or what her motive, or who Simon the "leper" was, are questions that cannot be answered. They are, however, of no great importance. And who were indignant at the supposed extravagance of using fifty dollars' worth of spikenard on the hair of Jesus is a point left vague in the oldest Gospel. It was very natural for a later generation¹ to make Judas the scape-goat to bear the blame of this parsimonious criticism, but evidence for this conclusion is wanting.

Jesus rebuked those who murmured at the woman's act, and himself generously defended it. It was a "good work;" it was preparatory to his burial; and its record should go as widely as the Gospel. Moreover the time was at hand when they could no more offer him any personal ministry of affection or honor. Thus it is manifest that Jesus, though he had silenced his adversaries in the temple, and though he was temporarily shielded by popular favor, was convinced that his end was near. That he took occasion to refer to it at table is in harmony with repeated utterances of the last few weeks and shows how important he felt it to be that his disciples should be forewarned of the approaching tragedy.

It is possible that this repeated and heavy announcement of Jesus concerning his immediate future had something to do with the resolve of Judas to betray him. If that disciple concluded from what Jesus said of his death that he could not be the Messiah—a very natural conclusion at that time—then his mind would be open to suggestions regarding the unwisdom of being identified with one against whom the leaders of Israel were arrayed as one man. But it is idle, with the data at our disposal, to attempt to analyze the mental process by which Judas became the betrayer of his Master. How far back that process reached we cannot tell.² There is no ground for

¹ See John 12:5-6.

² The view of the latest Gospel that Jesus knew from the beginning who it was that should betray him (6:64), and that, as early as the longer visit in Capernaum, Jesus said to the apostles, "Did not I choose you the Twelve and one of you is a devil (6:71)," is simply an inference from the assumed supernatural knowledge of Jesus.

supposing that when Jesus and the Twelve came up to Jerusalem, Judas had already contemplated turning against him. The fact that the all-powerful authorities in Jerusalem were declared enemies of Jesus was sufficiently ominous to set any disciple to thinking of his own personal safety, and to bring any germ of latent unbelief to rapid development. According to the oldest Gospel Judas was in touch with the priests two days before the Passover and was seeking how he might opportunely deliver Jesus to them.¹ We can readily believe that it was desired to dispose of Jesus before the great feast.² To proceed against him openly at that time would be likely to produce a dangerous uprising in his favor, and yet to leave him at large during the feast would be to run the risk of further strengthening his cause. Hence the urgent need of immediate action.

An apprehension of what was being plotted by his foes may account for the seeming fact that, according to the hints of time in the oldest Gospel,³ Jesus spent the last day before the Passover in close retirement. This would suggest very clearly that he purposed to determine in some measure the outward course of hostile procedure against him. Whether he had any other reason for wishing to postpone his arrest than the desire to keep the Passover with his disciples,⁴ we can only conjecture.

On the day when the Jews were accustomed to kill the Passover,⁵ that is, the 14th of the month Nisan,⁶ Jesus—whether at Bethany or elsewhere cannot be determined—sent two⁷ disciples into the city to prepare for the celebration of the feast. There is an air of mystery about the directions which Jesus gave to these men,⁸ which is probably to be explained as due to the presence of Judas

¹ Mk. 14:11.

² Mk. 14:2; Mt. 26:5; Lk. 22:2.

³ If Mk. 11:20 denotes the next day after that of 11:12, then this Gospel leaves Wednesday a blank.

⁴ Lk. 22:15.

⁵ Mk. 14:12; Lk. 22:7.

⁶ Lev. 23:5.

⁷ According to Lk. 22:8 these two disciples were Peter and John—possibly an inference from the fact that these were the chief apostles. It is at least singular that Mark, who derived his facts in part from Peter, should have omitted the names if he had ever heard them from that apostle.

⁸ Mk. 14:13, 15; Mt. 26:18; Lk. 22:10, 12.

and to the desire to leave him ignorant of the place of meeting. That the owner of the house to whom they were sent was acquainted with Jesus and knew how many apostles he had is clearly implied in the message to him: "The teacher saith, where is my guest-chamber, where I shall eat the Passover with my disciples?"¹ Surely not every householder in Jerusalem would have known who was meant by "The teacher," or would have been able and willing to place a large room at his disposal. Therefore it appears that Jesus had some definite person in mind, but was aware of the need of secrecy if he would have a quiet evening for the supper.²

At evening Jesus with the Twelve entered Jerusalem to keep the Passover, but no single detail of the observance has been preserved.³ That which, in this hour, impressed itself on the memory of the apostles was quite separate from the old national observance. There was, first, the startling word of Jesus that one of the Twelve would betray him.⁴ No doubt Jesus expressed himself in this *general* manner for a pedagogical reason. He wished that there should be a searching of heart among his disciples. But he who had extraordinary insight into the souls of men can hardly have been unaware of the alienation of Judas, and that it was he who was about to deliver him to his foes. To that disciple it must now have been plain that the Master was convinced of his disloyalty, and yet, by couching his disclosure in general terms, Jesus had spared Judas the humiliation which he must have felt had he been designated by name as the traitor.

It is possible—we cannot say *probable*—that one motive which led Jesus to make this announcement concerning his betrayal was that the traitor, finding that the Master saw through him, might depart and thus clear the spirit-

¹ Mk. 14:14; Mt. 26:18; Lk. 22:11.

² If the "young man" who was present at the arrest of Jesus (Mk. 14:51-52) was John Mark, the author of the second Gospel, then it seems probable that the Passover was celebrated by Jesus in the house of Mary the mother of Mark (Acts 12:12).

³ Unless Lk. 22:17-18 contains such a detail, for this connects the Lord's Supper with the passing of a cup in the paschal observance.

⁴ Mk. 14:18; Mt. 26:21; Lk. 22:21.

ual atmosphere for the last hour of intercourse between Jesus and his friends; and yet we cannot positively affirm that Judas went forth at this time. The oldest Gospel is silent, Luke lets Judas remain through the Lord's Supper,¹ but John sends him forth and relates the very circumstances of his departure (13:26-30).

The second unforgettable incident in the upper room was the profoundly personal turn which Jesus gave to the paschal supper. The account of this in the oldest Gospel, because of its greater simplicity, is to be preferred to those of Matthew and Luke.² According to this least ritualistic narrative Jesus, during the progress of the paschal meal,³ broke a loaf⁴ of bread with thanksgiving, and gave to the apostles with the words, "Take; this is my body."⁵ Later he gave them a cup, after words of thanksgiving, and they all drank of it.⁶ Then, *after* they had drunk, he told them what meaning he attached to the wine: "This is my covenant-blood which is shed for many."⁷ Finally, in line with this word about covenant-blood, he solemnly declared that he should not drink wine again until he drank it in the kingdom of God;⁸ that is to say, he announced that his end was near, but also alluded to a continuation of fellowship in the future.

We recognize that Jesus spoke in symbols, that bread and wine stood for his body and his blood. So much is clear. Further, the fact of his death is certainly in the foreground of the scene, and the partaking of the symbolic bread and wine received some of its significance, in his thought, from that fact. It is impossible to dissociate either symbol from him or from his self-sacrificing love. Herein may lie its essential meaning. But on the particular content of the symbols—if such there was in Jesus' thought—and on their appropriation by the disciples, the Master shed no light.

To return to the narrative. We cannot tell why Jesus went out to the Mount of Olives late in the night, though from what transpired there it is natural to conjecture

¹ Lk. 22:21.

² Preferred also to that of I Cor. 11:23-25.

³ Mk. 14:22.

⁴ Mk. 14:22.

⁵ Mk. 14:23.

⁶ Thin like our crackers but larger.

⁷ Mk. 14:24.

⁸ Mk. 14:25.

that he wished a degree of privacy which was not possible in the upper room. His reflections as they went forth from the city were full of sadness. He foresaw that all his disciples would be scattered in the days ahead,¹ but when he spoke his thought Peter declared that he at least would remain loyal.² In this strong self-confidence Jesus saw the shadow of Peter's aggravated denial.³ One of his apostles had already betrayed him, another was soon to deny him, and all the rest were to "stumble." With such thoughts he came to Gethsemane across the brook Kedron, not far from the city.

Of what transpired in that sacred spot we have glimpses only, for the three disciples who were near enough to Jesus to hear his words⁴ repeatedly fell asleep.⁵ Yet the words which one and another heard before sleep had overcome them, or in later intervals when Jesus aroused them, may give us an understanding of the nature of his experience.

The time spent in Gethsemane, whether short or long,⁶ was spent by Jesus chiefly in prayer, though the oldest Gospel seems to have a trace of an interval of quiet between the prayer and the arrest.⁷ One word that fell from the lips of Jesus in Gethsemane, perhaps fell from his lips many times in that hour, has come to us unchanged—the Aramaic word "Abba." The disciples heard him calling upon the Father, as he had taught them to do. They heard him make supplication that a certain "cup" might pass from him.⁸ This was his sole petition, so far as we know, though not all of his prayer, for the words "Not what I will but what thou wilt" may have been as vital a part of his communion with the Father, as profoundly involving both heart and will, as was the petition for the passing of the "cup." As to this "cup,"

¹ Mk. 14:27; Mt. 26:31.

² Mk. 14; 29; Mt. 26:33; Lk. 22:33.

³ Mk. 14:30; Mt. 26:34; Lk. 22:34.

⁴ Mk. 14:33; Mt. 26:37.

⁵ Mk. 14:37, 40; Mt. 26:40, 43; Lk. 22:45.

⁶ A period of an hour is perhaps the *least* that would satisfy the conditions of the narrative.

⁷ It seems necessary to assume an interval between the words "Sleep on now and take your rest," and, "Arise, let us be going" (Mk. 14:41-42).

⁸ Mk. 14:36; Mt. 26:39; Lk. 22:42.

the situation suggests that the symbol has the same meaning here as in Mk. 10:38, where it apparently refers to his death at the hands of the religious authorities in Israel. This petition implies that it seemed to Jesus *possible* for his Father, who has all power, to lead him to the goal of his Messianic labor by some other way than that of the shameful death which he saw just ahead. This thought is doubtless in contrast with that of the past weeks, even with that which was expressed in the upper room. Again and again Jesus had anticipated a violent death, and had spoken of it calmly, as in some sense a necessary and unavoidable event in his career. Now he prayed that the "cup" might pass away from him. The contrast is great, yet not wholly inexplicable. Jesus realized now, as he could not have done before, the loneliness and the horror of his fate. The nearest of his disciples could not watch with him one hour. The bravest of his friends was about to deny him. The religious leaders of his people stood ready to treat him as accursed. And all this was the return which men made for the most unselfish ministry and the most divine religious ideals. That the sensitive spirit of Jesus was overwhelmed and prayed that this "cup" might pass is the testimony of the oldest Gospel, nor does it seem unworthy of the greatest of all God's messengers. When, however, Jesus realized that it was his Father's will that the cup should not pass, he calmly awaited the approach of his enemies.

The seizure of Jesus was made by an armed band sent by the priests and led by Judas.¹ As it was carried out in the dead of night, and as Judas knew that Jesus would offer no resistance, it is not likely that the "multitude" (ὄχλος) who came to take him was very large.² There was no attempt to seize the disciples. Even that one who wounded a servant of the high priest was allowed to escape.³ The young man of whom the oldest Gospel

¹ Mk. 14:43; Mt. 26:47; Lk. 22:47.

² There is no occasion for the serious modification of the synoptic tradition by adopting Jn. 18:2.

³ According to the oldest Gospel (Mk. 14:47), the person who drew a sword was one of those who "stood by." It is not said that he was a disciple, nor is it necessary to assume that he was. It might have been the young man of vs. 51, or some other like him. If it had been an apostle,

speaks,¹ who appears to have followed the company even after the disciples had fled,² was laid hold upon indeed, but when he loosed himself from his captors and fled, no further notice was taken of him. It is clear that the authorities had no fear of the followers of Jesus.

The fact that Judas on coming up kissed Jesus³ was regarded by the disciples as a preconcerted signal by which Jesus should be pointed out to those who had come to seize him—another indication that he was not well known by sight to the temple police. Though Jesus offered no forcible resistance to seizure, he protested against its method, saying, "Are ye come out as against a robber with swords and staves to seize me?"⁴ He who had been allowed to teach in the temple unmolested is now seized as though he were a robber. To assume that he would fight for his freedom was utterly to mistake the spirit of his teaching, and hence he spoke the words of protest.

From the hour of the arrest of Jesus the details of his treatment are more variously given in the various Gospels than are the details of the preceding hours and days. This is not strange, for the disciples had fled from Jesus in Gethsemane. Peter followed into the court of the high priest,⁵ and was perhaps near enough to hear what was said in the trial of Jesus; but he himself was on trial, and not in a condition to take accurate note of what transpired in the high priest's court.⁶ Knowledge of that trial must therefore have come from persons—to us unknown—who were present, possibly from some one like Joseph of Arimathea⁷ who was even then friendly toward

and indeed the chief of the apostles, as the latest Gospel assumes (Jn. 18:10), it would be strange that the synoptic tradition knew nothing of it. Moreover it is not easy to believe that Jesus allowed one of his apostles to go armed. Luke 22:35-38, taken literally, might appear to justify the disciples in taking weapons as they went to Gethsemane, but we cannot understand how Jesus would have allowed them to act on a mistaken interpretation of his word.

¹ Mk. 14:51-52.

² Mk. 14:50.

³ Mk. 14:44-45; Mt. 26:48-49; Lk. 22:47-48.

⁴ Mk. 14:48; Mt. 26:55; Lk. 22:52.

⁵ Mk. 14:54; Mt. 26:58; Lk. 22:54-55.

⁶ If John also was present (18:15), it is strange that he was not challenged as well as Peter.

⁷ Mk. 15:43-46.

Jesus, possibly also from some one who, though not at that time friendly, afterward became a disciple. Of the more public trial before the Roman procurator and of the execution there may well have been friendly witnesses, if no one of the Twelve. But despite the numerous disagreements in the reports of the last hours of the life of Jesus—a fact which should induce great caution in the handling of separate details—the main steps in the trial and execution are ascertainable. Here as in many other places the oldest Gospel narrative is preëminent by reason of its simplicity and inner consistency. To this then we must give the greatest weight.

It was still night¹ when Jesus was taken to the high-priest,² and yet the different elements which constituted the sanhedrin appear to have been represented in the body which was gathered there.³ This fact indicates that some considerable time had elapsed since Judas left the upper room.

There were, according to Mark, certain witnesses who appeared against Jesus,⁴ and one remarkable piece of testimony—which is characterized in the narrative as false⁵—is given, to wit, that Jesus had said, "I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another made without hands."⁶ The oldest narrative in its representation that the sanhedrin heard various witnesses and yet refused to accept their testimony as sufficient certainly throws a favorable light upon that body. But it is of small account to know what was said against Jesus in the sanhedrin, for it is clear that he was at length judged worthy of death simply and solely on the strength of his own confession. The high-priest asked him if he was the Christ, and he replied affirmatively, adding a prophetic word expressive of confidence in the triumphant outcome of his mission.⁷ This

¹ Luke (22:66) postpones the formal gathering until morning, perhaps influenced thereto by Mk. 15:1.

² Mk. 14:72; 15:1.

³ Mk. 14:53; Mt. 26:57.

⁴ Mk. 14:56-58.

⁵ Yet the latest narrative (Jn. 2:19) has something quite similar which is given as historical.

⁶ Mk. 14:58.

⁷ Mk. 14:61-62; Mt. 26:63-64.—Luke's version of this incident (22:67-70) departs widely from that of Mark. The critical question is not put by the

dramatic moment when Jesus and the highpriest faced each other and exchanged these solemn words would not have been easily forgotten by any one present, nor the fact that the confession of Jesus was held to be justly decisive against him. It was blasphemy, and for blasphemy he was condemned to death.¹ If there was any favorable sentiment among the judges, it did not manifest itself, and Jesus was immediately treated as a condemned and hated criminal.²

It is not for us summarily to condemn the Supreme Court of Israel because of this verdict against Jesus. Nineteen centuries of Christian history show indeed that it was essentially wrong, but do not prove that it was technically invalid, or that the judges were wholly and wilfully blind to the truth. From the orthodox point of view the case against Jesus appeared to be strong. He had come forward as a teacher, and had even assumed authority unsparingly to criticize the religious leaders, and yet he had no rabbinical credentials to show; he had allowed himself to be hailed as the bringer of the Davidic kingdom, though he was unacknowledged by the head of God's people, and had no other support than that of a few Galilean rustics; and now, though a helpless prisoner, without a shred of Messianic equipment, as that was popularly conceived, he had dared to claim to be the supreme messenger of God! That it must have appeared blasphemous in the judgment of the court for such an individual to arrogate to himself the sublime Messianic mission one may readily admit. Jesus' conception of the kingdom of God was, at least for the present, unintelligible both to the leaders and to the people.

The episode of Peter's denial³ must be looked at against the background of the completed trial and condemnation of Jesus. The fall of his leader may have heightened Peter's sense of his own peril, and more than that, it may

high priest but by *all* the sanhedrists; Jesus does not answer frankly and clearly, but vaguely; and instead of using the symbolism of Dan. 7:13, as is done in Mark, we have this very different thought: "From henceforth shall the Son of Man be seated at the right hand of God."

¹ Mk. 14:63-64; Mt. 26:65-66; Lk. 22:71.

² Mk. 14:65; Mt. 26:67-68; Lk. 22:63-65.

³ Mk. 14:66-72; Mt. 26:69-75; Lk. 22:56-62.

well have shattered, temporarily, his faith in that leader, for it is altogether probable that the disciples continued to the last to hope that, in the hour of the Messiah's utmost extremity, God would wondrously intervene on his behalf. In these circumstances Peter repeatedly denied that he was a disciple, and when the charge was finally backed up with the obvious fact that he was a Galilean, he was driven to use oaths in confirmation of his denial. Yet his peril was more apparent than real, for he was allowed to go forth from the place of trial whithersoever he would.

In the early morning the sanhedrists, after a consultation that probably concerned the method in which they should seek Pilate's sanction of their verdict, took Jesus to the Roman Governor.¹

We must suppose that the charge which they brought against him was that he claimed to be the king of the Jews, for Pilate's question implies this.² In a certain sense this charge was valid, for Jesus had said that he was the Christ, and the Christ was universally thought of as a king; yet as it must have been understood by the Roman, who cannot be credited with any knowledge of Jesus' own conception of Messiahship, it undoubtedly conveyed a wrong impression. He must have thought of Jesus as a political pretender, and when Jesus, in response to his question, "Art thou the king of the Jews?" replied in the affirmative, he probably regarded him as a harmless fanatic. It is obvious at any rate that he saw nothing serious in the accusation.

It appears that the narrative of the oldest Gospel is here to be supplemented from Luke, who reports that Pilate, on hearing that Jesus was a Galilean, sent him to Herod.³ This incident may have been omitted as not materially affecting the story. It certainly accords with Pilate's

¹ Mk. 15:1; Mt. 27:1.—Since Judea was a Roman province only the procurator had the power of life and death.—The great divergence between Matthew and Luke (Mt. 27:3-10, Acts 1:18-20) in regard to the fate of Judas, which Matthew introduces at this point in his narrative, is unfavorable to the supposition that there was any certain knowledge on the subject at the time of the composition of these writings. Matthew's story looks as though determined more or less completely by Zech. 11:12-13.

² Mk. 15:2; Mt. 27:11; Lk. 23:3.

³ Lk. 23:5-7.

manifest unwillingness to grant the request of the Jews that he should have sought to shift the responsibility of judgment to Herod's shoulders. Why Herod refused to dispose of the case, as he had done with that of the Baptist, we are not told. Had he done so, the axe instead of the cross, might have been the symbol of Christianity!

When Jesus was brought back to the Roman bar, Pilate, either in response to a request of the populace that he should release unto them a prisoner according to custom,¹ or of his own motion,² proposed to set him free.³ This was a clever proposition, especially so if Pilate had detected any signs of popular sympathy for Jesus, but it was counteracted by the priests who were evidently present in such numbers that they controlled the crowd.⁴ When afterward Pilate sounded the feeling of those present in regard to the popular will, there was a cry that Jesus should be crucified, that is, be dealt with as one who was guilty in the eye of the *Roman* law,⁵ and when Pilate, who had some sense of justice in his bosom, asked what evil Jesus had done, he was answered with the same fanatical cry.⁶ Then, as he feared a tumult more than he cared to secure justice for the prisoner, he delivered him to be crucified.⁷ His technical justification of the act must have been that Jesus claimed to be the king of the Jews. This was the indictment placed upon the cross.⁸ The soldiers to whom Jesus was delivered—whether *Italian* or *Syrian* we do not know—seem to have shared the very general popular feeling of ill-will against Jews, for while making preparation, in the praetorium, for the execution, they are reported to have treated him cruelly.⁹

At the third hour of the morning,¹⁰ the soldiers

¹ Mk. 15:6-8.

² Mt. 27:17; Lk. 23:16-18.

³ Mk. 15:9.

⁴ Mk. 15:11; Mt. 27:20.

⁵ Mk. 15:13; Mt. 27:22; Lk. 23:21.

⁶ Mk. 15:14; Mt. 27:23; Lk. 23:23.

⁷ The incident of Pilate's wife (Mt. 27:19) and the washing of his hands before the multitude (27:24) are both designed to emphasize the innocence of Jesus. It is difficult to regard them as containing any historical element.

⁸ Mk. 15:26; Mt. 27:37; Lk. 23:38.

⁹ Mk. 15:16-20; Mt. 27:27-31.

¹⁰ Mk. 15:25.—In view of our ignorance as to the time needful for the various incidents between the arrest of Jesus and his crucifixion, and the indefiniteness of *ἡσπέρ* in Mk. 15:1, it seems unwarrantable to say that the third hour is intrinsically improbable.

appointed to the task¹ took Jesus out of the city,² on the way forcing an African Jew by the name of Simon to carry his cross,³ and at a place called Golgotha ("skull"),⁴ in a manner that is fortunately not described and on a cross whose shape is not determinable,⁵ after they had mercifully offered him a narcotic which he did not receive,⁶ they executed him, and with him two robbers.⁷

The garments of Jesus were divided among the soldiers with the casting of lots⁸—an evidence that they were considered to have some intrinsic value, for these foreign soldiers would not have prized them for any sentimental reason.

There is no trace in the oldest Gospel that any one of the apostles witnessed the crucifixion of their Master,⁹ but certain women are said to have beheld it from afar.¹⁰ We are told that the hatred of his foes followed him to the cross and there sought to add to his torments, and that even those who hung in agony beside him railed on him.¹¹

In the middle of the afternoon the only words which fell from the lips of the crucified, according to the oldest Gospel,¹² were spoken, being the first words of Ps. 22: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" The agony which could have wrung from the heart of Jesus this cry of utter loneliness is unimaginable. The conception of the character of God which Jesus has done the

¹ The number can hardly have been as small as four (Jn. 19:23) since there were three prisoners to be executed.

² Mk. 15:20; Mt. 27:32.

³ Mk. 15:21; Mt. 27:32; Lk. 23:26.

⁴ Mk. 15:22.

⁵ The statement of Mt. 27:37, that the judicial charge was placed *over* the head of Jesus, shows that in the thought of its author the upright beam extended somewhat higher than the body which was affixed to it.

⁶ Mk. 15:27; Mt. 27:38; Lk. 23:32.

⁷ Mk. 15:27.

⁸ Mk. 15:24.

⁹ The situation in Jn. 19:26-27 is at variance with the oldest Gospel (Mk. 15:40); Jn. 19:28-29 can not be held by the side of Mk. 15:34-36; and Jn. 19:30 is hardly in accord with Mk. 15:37 or with Lk. 23:46.

¹⁰ Mk. 15:40-41; Mt. 27:55-56; Lk. 23:49.

¹¹ Mk. 15:29-32; Mt. 27:39-44; Lk. 23:35-37.

¹² Mk. 15:34-Lk. 23:34 is double-bracketed by Westcott and Hort as an early interpolation; 23:39-43, in view of the oldest Gospel (Mk. 15:32), must apparently be regarded as of late origin; and 23:46, a modification of Ps. 31:5, takes the place in this Gospel which is held in the oldest narrative by the quotation from Ps. 22:1—a fact that seems to require a choice between the two utterances, and if this be so, the choice must be for the words of the oldest Gospel.

most to establish in the human heart forbids our thinking that the Father *had* in any sense forsaken him, yea rather requires us to believe that he looked on Jesus with immeasurable love and compassion, and that if he ever arbitrarily departed from his divinely ordered modes of working, he would here have intervened with a miracle to deliver from agony the one pure spirit of earth.

The Aramaic words of Jesus caught the ear of some Jewish onlookers who were more familiar with apocalyptic dreams than with the text of Scripture, and who therefore thought that Jesus was calling on Elijah for help;¹ and when some one, moved with pity by the sufferings of Jesus, pressed a sponge of strong wine to his lips, those who thought he was calling for Elijah interfered, saying, "Wait: let us see whether Elijah comes to take him down."² But the end was at hand, and with a loud cry—whether voluntary or involuntary we do not know—Jesus expired.³

According to the oldest Gospel, which puts the death of Jesus in the middle of the afternoon, his lifeless body hung upon the cross several hours, for not until evening was it taken down.⁴ Then a stranger appeared on the scene, one Joseph of Arimathea, an honorable councillor,⁵ and he boldly went to Pilate and asked for the body of Jesus. The act required some boldness, for it identified the doer with what appeared to be a lost cause, and affixed to him a social stigma, for Jesus had been put to death by the leading priests and scribes. Where the apostles were in this hour of opportunity we do not know. Some of them at least were potential heroes, as later history shows, but their failure to care for the body of their Master was very human and unheroic.

So the body of Jesus was taken in charge by a charitable stranger and placed in a rock-tomb.⁶ Where this tomb

¹ Mk. 15:34-35; Mt. 27:46-47.

² We follow here the view of Mt. 27:48-49.

³ Mk. 15:37; Mt. 27:50; Lk. 23:46.

⁴ Mk. 15:42; Mt. 27:57; Lk. 23:54.

⁵ Mk. 15:43; Mt. 27:57; Lk. 23:50.

⁶ Mk. 15:46.

was we do not know,¹ and whether it belonged to Joseph the oldest Gospel does not say. Two women—Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses²—beheld where the body was laid. They therefore form the connecting link between the earthly life of Jesus and that mysterious forty-day period between the Resurrection and the Ascension, which still furnishes Christian thought with some difficult problems.

But the career of Jesus as a character of history terminated at an unknown tomb near Jerusalem. Here therefore this part of our study ends.

¹ The representation of the latest Gospel appears to be idealized throughout (Jn. 19:38-42). There the body is not buried hastily, and merely enswathed in linen wrapping, but with all due regard to custom, in an elaborate and expensive manner. Moreover the tomb is new and undefiled by contact with a dead body.

² Mk. 15:47.

PART III

THE LEGENDARY JESUS

CHAPTER I

LEGENDS OF THE BIRTH AND INFANCY OF JESUS

THE material of Matthew's story of the birth of Jesus may be conveniently described under three heads—the Genealogy, Joseph's acceptance of Mary when her condition was known, and the visit of the Magi with its consequences in the massacre of the children of Bethlehem and the flight of Joseph with his family into Egypt.

The form of the Genealogy¹ is obviously artificial—fourteen generations from Abraham to David, again the same number from David to the Babylonian captivity (a period about half as long as the preceding), and finally fourteen more from that event to Christ. That the generations are not *all* enumerated is seen, for example, in the fact that the writer passes from Jehoram directly to Uzziah,² thus omitting three generations—Ahaziah, Jehoash and Amaziah. The purpose of this Genealogy is to show that Jesus was sprung from Davidic stock, and so fulfilled the prevailing expectation in regard to the coming Deliverer. He is not only sprung from David, but like him he stands at the apex of a long series of generations. Not otherwise can we explain the artificial arrangement which sets Jesus over against David as the last of a series of fourteen. That the purpose of the Genealogy was thus doctrinal rather than historical is confirmed in a measure by the fact that the first Gospel shows a fondness for the title "Son of David."³

The second section of Matthew's story of the nativity of Jesus centers in Joseph's acceptance of his betrothed after her condition had become known to him. The supernatural conception of Jesus is the great assertion of

¹ Mt. 1:1-17.

² Mt. 1:8.

³ Peculiar to it are the following instances: 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 21:9, 15.

these verses,¹ but it is regarded from the point of view of Joseph, and as a fact of a somewhat distant past. Joseph believed, at first, that his betrothed had been unfaithful to him. While in this state of mind he dreamed, and in his dream he heard from the lips of an angel that the condition of Mary was of supernatural origin. It was due to the Spirit of God. He was also informed that the child was to deliver the people from their sins. Convinced by this dream, Joseph took his betrothed to his home. But before narrating this result the writer says that the condition of Mary, and the mission of her child, were a fulfilment of the prophet's words:²

"Behold, the virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son,

And they shall call his name Immanuel."

Here is manifest the *purpose* of this section, which is to show that the birth of Jesus without a human father was what had been foretold.

The third section of Matthew's story³ consists of the visit of the Magi together with two widely diverse consequences of that visit. The *time* of the visit of the Magi is roughly indicated as less than two years after the birth of Jesus. The author lets Herod inquire of the Magi at what time the star of the new king appeared,⁴ and then says that Herod, in order to destroy the child, slew all the male children in Bethlehem and its vicinity from *two years old and under*, according to the time which he had carefully learned of the wise men.⁵ It is assumed by Herod that the star appeared at the same time that Jesus was born, but there is no indication how long the journey of the Magi had been, and it is left uncertain whether they started immediately on the star's appearance.

It is in this section regarding the Magi that the narrative first mentions the *place* of Jesus' birth. This was unknown to the seekers from the East. The star which they had seen told them only that the king of the Jews was born. Then they journeyed to the capital, and there sought more specific information. Herod obtained

¹ Mt. 1:18-25.

² Is. 7:14.

³ Mt. 2.

⁴ Mt. 2:7.

⁵ Mt. 2:16.

this information for them from the highest rabbinical authorities, who based their answer on Micah 5:2, and then he sent them to Bethlehem, the town which the scribes and priests had designated, leaving them to ascertain for themselves the *exact* location of the child. Just at this juncture, to their glad surprise, the star again appeared to them and guided them to the house which they sought. They presented their gifts and homage, and would have returned to Herod with the information which he desired had they not received warning in a dream, which led them to take another route.¹ The obvious purpose of this section is to glorify the birth of Jesus.

The visit of the Magi had two important consequences. In the first place, it brought destruction upon the male children of Bethlehem and its vicinity,² for Herod, who had planned to get possession of the new-born king with the aid of the Magi, thought he could accomplish his fell design in spite of their refusal to aid him. If he could not destroy one child by itself, he yet would destroy it by destroying *all*. And in this deed of blood was fulfilled, the writer tells us, the word of Jeremiah (31:15):

"A voice was heard in Ramah,

Weeping and great mourning,

Rachel weeping for her children;

And she would not be comforted, because they are not."

The other consequence, though not tragic, was most noteworthy. Joseph was warned of Herod's design and was commanded to flee into Egypt with the child and its mother.³ He was also commanded to remain in Egypt until the heavenly messenger should give him further direction as to his course.

Thus warned, Joseph left Bethlehem by night, and fled into Egypt, where he remained until the death of Herod. The flight into Egypt made it possible, the writer says, that the prophet's word⁴ should be fulfilled, "Out of Egypt did I call my son."

Then, after narrating the bloody deed of Herod and

¹ Mt. 2:12.

² Mt. 2:16.

³ Mt. 2:13.

⁴ Hos. 11:1.

Herod's own death, the writer tells how Joseph returned to the land of Israel, and how, fearing to go into Judea where Archelaus was reigning in his father's stead, and being instructed in a dream, he withdrew into Galilee, and settled in a city called Nazareth. This move also was to the end that what was spoken by the prophets might be fulfilled that he should be called a "Nazarene."¹

Such, in brief statement, is Matthew's familiar story of the birth and infancy of Jesus. This treatment of the subject is to be regarded as poetical and doctrinal rather than historical. To this conclusion we are forced when we examine the story in the light of what Jesus says of himself, and in the light of the earliest Gospel. That witness has already been presented, and we can proceed at once to test this story by it.

Matthew's story is framed, in part, to prove the Davidic descent of Jesus. This is the sole purpose of the Genealogy, and in the story of the visit of the Magi the prominence given to Micah's words emphasizes the point of Davidic descent. But Jesus never suggested that he was of the lineage of David; on the contrary, he appears to have regarded the Scripture proof for the Messiah's descent from David as, to say the least, uncertain. And the townsmen of Jesus in Nazareth appear not to have heard of this relationship. This item, therefore, while not absolutely excluded from the domain of history, is set in an unfavorable light by the *Logia* and the earliest Gospel.

Following Matthew's order of narration, we come next to the statement of supernatural conception. How does this agree with the *Logia* and with the oldest Gospel?

Two points, very unequal in weight, are here to be considered. We shall first mention the less important of the two. The oldest Gospel represents the mother of Jesus with some of her sons as seeking to interrupt his public work.² They thought that he was out of his right mind. Now it seems impossible to explain this action of Mary if she knew that Jesus was of supernatural origin.

¹ Mt. 2:23.

² Mk. 3:21, 31.

It would betray an unexampled presumption and extreme forgetfulness of what her secret required of her. Her action is not *easy* of explanation even if Jesus was her child by Joseph; but it seems hopelessly at variance with the view that he had been supernaturally given to her.

The other point to be considered in answering the question how Matthew's story of the supernatural conception agrees with the *Logia* and the oldest Gospel is the silence of Jesus. To this fact, hitherto quite neglected, it would seem as though we ought to ascribe *supreme significance*. We have seen that in the words of Jesus both in the *Logia* and throughout the synoptists there is no allusion to his birth. So far as his words have been preserved, we can say that they completely ignore the subject of his origin.

Now it is reasonable to believe that Jesus knew all that was to be known regarding his parentage and birth. It is also reasonable to believe that he would have told his disciples if there had been anything regarding his parentage or birth that was of importance for their understanding of him. If he was aware that his birth had been absolutely unique; if, to quote the language of the creed, he was aware that he had been "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the virgin Mary;" if he was aware that his relation to God was thus essentially different from that of his brothers and sisters and of all men, then his silence becomes unintelligible, if not wholly unthinkable. For those who look upon Jesus as the final authority in regard to himself the teaching of Matthew's story that he had no human father cannot be looked on as historical.

We come now to the visit of the Magi. These men, whether Arabians or Persians, were Gentiles, and they came to worship the king of the Jews. That they used the word "king" in its common significance, and meant a political ruler of the Jews, need not be argued. It is obvious that Herod so understood them, and all Jerusalem. This event and its consequences—the massacre of the male children of Bethlehem and the flight into Egypt—were too extraordinary to be forgotten in a single generation, or to have remained without an echo in the

career of Jesus. That an occurrence of *national* significance, and one that touched the burning question of the appearance of the Messiah, could have transpired and have left no other trace in the literature of the first century than what we have in the second chapter of Matthew seems most improbable. One should be careful, of course, in using the argument from silence, but it would be foolish to refuse to use it at all. The visit of the Magi, even if their precious gifts were not kept as souvenirs, would have been a family tradition of the first magnitude, and it is not in keeping with human nature to suppose that it would not have become known in Nazareth. Had the visit of the Magi been a fact of history, and had Jesus been hailed by them as king of the Jews, it would have tended, humanly speaking, to fit him for a leader of the Zealots, a greater Judas of Gamala, rather than to be a carpenter, and then a spiritual teacher of the kingdom of heaven. For such a visit from afar, suggested by a heavenly sign, would have been regarded, in that age of the world, as an unmistakable expression of the will of God. It would have laid the most solemn responsibility on the parents and later on the child. The parents would have trained Jesus with that royal destiny ever in view, and he, when arrived at maturity, would least of all have failed to be influenced by it.

The material of Luke's story of the Nativity forms a cycle of three parts—the Annunciation, with the resulting visit to Elizabeth,¹ the birth in Bethlehem, which includes the shepherd idyl,² and the presentation in the temple, with the accompanying songs of Simeon and Anna.³

The annunciation to Mary is elaborate and full of detail. It was in the sixth month after the conception of John the Baptist, it was made by Gabriel to a virgin named Mary in Nazareth of Galilee, and made after her betrothal to Joseph, who was of Davidic lineage. There is no suggestion that the interview with Gabriel was in a dream.

The annunciation by the angel consists of two parts—

¹ Lk. 1:26-56.

² Lk. 2:1-20.

³ Lk. 2:21-39.

the first full and complete,¹ and the second occasioned by Mary's question.² The original and independent announcement was that Mary should have a son, Jesus, to whom should be given the throne of his father David and who should set up an everlasting kingdom. With the exception of the personal name "Jesus" the announcement is drawn entirely from Old Testament passages, and there is no suggestion that the origin of the child was to be unique.³

Mary's wondering question brings a further and much more remarkable communication from Gabriel. It is now said that the promised child shall be supernaturally given, and for that reason shall be called "holy," the "Son of God." The announcement closes with a word of human comfort. The angel says that a kinswoman of Mary, Elizabeth by name, has come to know the mighty power of God's word, for though old and childless she is soon to have a son. In consequence of this announcement Mary visits Elizabeth in some unnamed city of Judah,⁴ and there, apparently under the influence of Elizabeth's words of greeting, her heart overflows with song.⁵ The personal note in this song culminates in the thought that she was to be called "Blessed" unto all generations.⁶ In the future which was opened unto her she saw the proud put down and the lowly exalted.

Not less elaborate and rich in detail is the second section of Luke's story of the nativity. Mary now goes a second time into Judea, this time to Bethlehem, in company with Joseph, the occasion being an imperial enrollment. Although Joseph was of the house and family of David, he could not secure accommodations in the inn, but must lodge where cattle were kept. In such an environment Jesus was born.

This event was at once celebrated in a wondrous manner. Somewhere in the vicinity of Bethlehem an angel

¹ Lk. 1:30-33.

² Lk. 1:35-37.

³ The difference between the original announcement and the response to Mary's question is significant, and somewhat confirms the textual argument against vs. 35. It is to be noted also that the reason for the title "Son of God" is not consistent with its meaning in the synoptic Gospels.

⁴ Lk. 1:39, 56.

⁵ Lk. 1:46-55.

⁶ Lk. 1:48.

announced to shepherds that a saviour had been born, and gave them certain particulars by means of which they would be able to find him. This announcement was followed by words of praise to God from a multitude of the heavenly host who had suddenly become visible. When at length the angels vanished, the shepherds went to Bethlehem, found the babe in a manger, and returned to their flocks, glorifying and praising God.

The last scene in Luke's cycle of the Nativity includes the two acts by which the requirements of the Law were met—circumcision on the eighth day,¹ when the child was also named, and presentation in the temple, accompanied by a sacrifice, on the fortieth day. This latter event became memorable in a wholly unexpected manner. For when a certain Jerusalemite by the name of Simeon saw the child, he recognized him as the Lord's Christ,²

"A light for revelation to the Gentiles

And the glory of thy people Israel."

He blessed the parents and spoke prophetic words to Mary, whose tragic tone contrasts strongly with the joyous satisfaction of the preceding words, for he declared that a sword should pierce through her soul.

When Simeon had finished speaking, the prophetess Anna came up, and seems immediately to have recognized the great mission of the child, for she gave thanks to God and spoke of him to all who were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem.³ Then the parents took their child to their own city Nazareth.⁴

Such is Luke's story of the Nativity. That its form is largely poetical needs no proof; that its content also is poetical, not historical, one is led to admit by examining it in the light of the *Logia* and of the oldest Gospel. It is not necessary to dwell here on the assertion that the conception of Jesus was supernatural. We have already spoken of that in discussing Matthew's story of the birth of Jesus. On one point, however, it is well to reflect. If the attitude of Mary toward Jesus, as recorded in the earliest Gospel, is inconsistent with Matthew's narrative

¹ Lk. 2:21.

² Lk. 2:26.

³ Lk. 2:36-38.

⁴ Lk. 2:39.

of the supernatural conception, it is still more strikingly inconsistent with Luke's narrative. For here Mary is explicitly told by Gabriel that her Son is to be a gift of the Holy Spirit, and that he is to receive the throne of his father David; she is greeted by Elizabeth as blessed among women; she hears from the shepherds—we may naturally assume this—what the angel had told them; and finally, she hears the words of the devout Simeon and the prophetess Anna. We cannot believe that after all these testimonies, human and divine, testimonies of the most absolute and unimpeachable character, she could have been so far from believing in her Son that she thought him out of his right mind, and sought to interrupt the course of his ministry, when he was teaching and healing in Galilee.

The idyl of the shepherds and the scene in the temple at the presentation of Jesus, if taken as historical, seem deeply inconsistent with the experience of Jesus at his baptism in the Jordan. Let the two facts be set clearly side by side. The event which turned the life of Jesus into the channel of public service, the event which produced a deeper commotion in his soul than any other except the fate that he confronted when in Gethsemane, was the divine assurance that he was called to the Messianic work. This was the culmination of his devotion of himself to the kingdom of God in submitting to the baptism of John. We not only have no trace of this great assurance in the earlier life of Jesus, but the experience itself, with the subsequent temptation of which it was the occasion, is psychologically inconceivable if, in his private life from childhood on, he had gone about with the angelic announcement in his soul which was made by the shepherds, and had been familiar with the prophetic declarations of Simeon and Anna. These events, unlike the announcement to Mary concerning the origin of her son, were *public* property, and we should be unfaithful to the laws of human nature were we to suppose that these extraordinary occurrences were promptly forgotten, and that Jesus grew up totally ignorant of them.

The unhistorical character of the Matthaean and Lucan

stories of the Nativity cannot be more strongly presented than by showing that they are not consistent with the words of Jesus or with the oldest Gospel. There are, however, certain other aspects of the two narratives which are not to be overlooked when seeking to know whether these narratives are historical, and to these we now turn.

There is first, a lack of harmony between the two narratives. Thus we find an unremovable difference of view as to the *home* of Joseph and Mary. According to Luke, this was Nazareth,¹ according to Matthew it was Bethlehem.² According to Luke, the parents returned to Nazareth immediately after the presentation of Jesus in the temple, that is, when he was about forty days old;³ according to Matthew, they remained in Bethlehem a considerable time, perhaps a year, for Herod's calculation that the child would surely be included if he destroyed all the children of Bethlehem who were under two years of age is left uncorrected by the evangelist.⁴ Luke's narrative, it will be noticed, leaves no room for a flight into Egypt. It will also be noticed that it leaves no place for the visit of the Magi. For Matthew's narrative clearly implies that at the time of this visit the child was several months old. But according to Luke the family left for Nazareth when Jesus was only about forty days old. Moreover, if we were to assume, contrary to the evident sense of Matthew, that the visit of the Magi fell *within* these forty days, then we should be face to face with the difficulty that, while in Matthew the family of Joseph flee into Egypt to escape Herod, in Luke they go, as it were, into the lion's den—go to Jerusalem, into the temple, and there attract extraordinary attention, which surely would not be favorable to their escape from Herod's aroused suspicions.

Thus the two narratives, in respect to these matters of place and time, are not consistent with each other—a serious matter indeed if they are held to be historical, but not serious if they are free poetic treatments of the subject of Jesus' birth.

¹ Lk. 2:4, 39.² Mt. 2:1, 23.³ Lk. 2:22, 39.⁴ Mt. 2:16.

Another aspect of these narratives which supports what has been said is the literary difference between them and the Gospels as a whole. According to the *Logia* Jesus said nothing about angels and in the earliest Gospel there is but a single reference to angels in the earthly career of Jesus,¹ and that is in a passage which is generally regarded as rhetorical. In Luke there is also a single reference to an angel appearing to Jesus, but the text of this passage is uncertain.² But in the narratives of the birth of Jesus, on the other hand, angels are in the foreground. Joseph is persuaded by an angel to take Mary,³ he is commanded by an angel to fly into Egypt and by an angel to return to the land of Israel;⁴ Gabriel visits Mary in Nazareth,⁵ an angel announces the birth of Jesus to the shepherds,⁶ and a multitude of angels celebrate that announcement.⁷ Thus the narrative is strongly characterized and at the same time marked off from the story of the public ministry of Jesus by the presence of angels. Does that suggest history or poetry?

Akin to this feature is Matthew's star. What the Magi saw in the east need not occasion wonder, but what took place between Jerusalem and Bethlehem, and then over Bethlehem, can hardly be looked upon otherwise than as poetry, for now the star *moved* before them and *stood* over the spot where the young child was. But obviously the wise men of old could not have found a particular house in a village by its being located exactly *under* a star—a feat impossible to modern astronomers with the most accurate instruments.

Another point is to be noted in speaking of the literary peculiarity of the narratives of the birth of Jesus, and that is the presence of poetry in Luke's story. Mary replied in verse to Elizabeth's greeting, and in verse did Simeon also utter his joy. We do not naturally think of these poems as extemporaneous, but rather as careful deliberate productions, and their presence is another sign that the story in which they are found is not to be read as history.

¹ Mk. 1:13.² Mt. 1:20.³ Lk. 1:26.⁴ Lk. 2:13.⁵ Lk. 22:43.⁶ Mt. 2:13, 19.⁷ Lk. 2:9.

While speaking of the differences between the two synoptic stories of the birth of Jesus, it may be noted that neither story is consistent with the implications of the Fourth Gospel. According to this writing, the Logos became flesh in Jesus,¹ and the Logos is conceived as an eternal, divine, personal Being.² But if Jesus was the incarnation of the eternal Logos, he was obviously not a child of the Spirit, as the synoptic story represents. Moreover the author of the Fourth Gospel suggests that the incarnation of the Logos in Jesus was an *ethical process*,³ and therefore essentially unlike the origin of Jesus as given in the synoptic stories.

It has already been suggested what *aim* the writers had in various sections of their narratives of the birth of Jesus. Let this aspect of the subject be here briefly summarized. Matthew in his Genealogy wished to show the Davidic descent of Jesus; in his account of the Lord's birth, to show that he had no human father; in the visit of the Magi, to show the world-wide significance of Jesus' birth; and in the Egyptian sojourn and the settlement in Nazareth, to show both the fulfilment of Scripture in the career of Jesus and also how he was cared for in the providence of God.

Pass to Luke's narrative. In the Annunciation, the promised child is described, first, as a descendant of David and heir to his throne, then as without earthly father; in the account of Jesus' birth, there is an evident emphasis on the significance of its occurrence in Bethlehem, the city of David; in the idyl of the shepherds, the birth of Jesus is glorified by a disclosure of the profound interest which the unseen world took in it; and in the story of the presentation in the temple, the words of prophecy celebrate Jesus as the fulfilment of the promise of God, and also throw across the story of the Nativity its only shadow in the reference to the Messiah's tragic fate.

¹ Jn. 1:14.

² Jn. 1:1-5.

³ Jn. 1:12.—The incarnation seems to have been regarded by the author as the supreme instance of the same divine process that had been realized in former times.

These motives differ somewhat among themselves, yet they may all without violence be comprehended under the general thought of *glorifying* Jesus. With this *aim* the Church sympathizes as deeply today as did its predecessor at the close of the first century, but we should not express ourselves in the same way that was chosen by the ancient Church. With the changed view of the nature of prophecy and the tendency to judge Jesus by what he was in himself, we are coming to disregard the corner-stone of the old apologetics, and to consider it a matter of little moment whether Jesus was physically descended from David, whether he was called out of Egypt agreeably to Hosea 10:1, and whether it is possible to make Jeremiah's words apply to the massacre of the male infants of Bethlehem.

Again, the changed thought of the universe which has brought astrology into disrepute and which finds the manifestation of God's good pleasure in the *laws* of matter and spirit under which we live rather than in the appearance of supernatural beings, would lead us, if we were for the first time seeking to describe the significance of the birth of Jesus in a worthy manner—would lead us to forms of expression quite different from the story of the Magi and the idyl of the shepherds. The nature and scope of the mission of Jesus are far more broadly and truly understood in the Church of today than they were at the close of the first century. Inevitably, therefore, if we were freely imagining the circumstances of his birth, our pictures would not wholly agree with those of the early writers who essayed this task. With their fundamental aim and feeling we truly sympathize, and we cherish their expression of that aim and feeling as a permanent enrichment of Christian literature, though it is no longer a natural expression for us.

There is one point in the story of the origin of Jesus which, because it deeply affects his person, has been of overshadowing influence in the history of the Church—we refer of course to its representation that Jesus had no human father. We have already considered this in the light of the *Logia* and the oldest Gospel. As it is

inconsistent with those sources, it cannot be regarded as historical. But the great importance which it has had in Christian history leads us, in concluding this chapter, to consider its origin.

It is hardly necessary to show that the doctrine of the supernatural conception of the Messiah is *essentially* un-Jewish. It is well known that the Old Testament never contemplates a future deliverer who is other than a true normal man. The thought of a Messiah who is physically sprung from God is altogether foreign to it. The appeal to Is. 7:14, first made in Matthew, is not an appeal to the original text of the prophet, but to an incorrect Greek translation. The "young woman" of the Hebrew original became a "virgin" in the Septuagint, and this seemed to furnish excellent Scripture authority for the view set forth in our first and third Gospels. But this was a delusion. The great prophet was made responsible for a teaching which neither he nor any Old Testament writer ever entertained.

This teaching is likewise foreign to Jewish writings of the period between the Old Testament and the coming of Jesus. The *Similitudes* of Enoch speak of a heavenly Messiah, but there is no trace of the idea that this heavenly being was to come into organic relation to mankind by birth from a virgin.

It is true that the story of the birth of Jesus, especially as given by Luke, has a Jewish *color*. It speaks of Gabriel, of the throne of David, the house of Jacob and other details that are Jewish; but this color may have been given by a Gentile writer as well as by a Jew.¹ Moreover, it is merely color; it does not touch the essence of the story. For the source of *this* we must turn to the Greek element of the early Church. This element was saturated with the thought that great persons were the offspring of gods. Such were the mighty figures of prehistoric times, Hercules and Aesculapius, Hermes and Dionysos. Such also were the distinguished

¹ *Wilhelm Tell* has even more than a mere Swiss *color*, yet Schiller was not Swiss; and *Julius Caesar* has more than a mere Latin *color*, yet Shakespeare was not a Roman.

characters of history in ever increasing numbers. From the fifth century before Christ onward into our era the belief in physical descent from a god and an earthly mother pervaded all classes of society. Speusippus, nephew and successor of Plato as head of the Academy, believed that the great philosopher was born of a virgin. Philo of Alexandria was so deeply influenced by Greek philosophy that he ascribed the paternity of Isaac directly to God. Justin Martyr, who was born not long after the composition of our Matthew and Luke and in whom we can see how an educated Greek Christian looked at the doctrine of the supernatural origin of Jesus, said in his *Apology* addressed to Antoninus Pius: "When we say that the Word, who is the first birth of God, was produced without sexual union, and that he, Jesus Christ, our teacher, was crucified and rose again and ascended into heaven, we propound nothing different from what you believe regarding those whom you esteem sons of Jupiter." And again he says: "If we affirm that he was born of a virgin, accept this in common with what you accept of Perseus."

We shall not transcend the Greek environment of the early Church if we draw an illustration from Roman history, for in this point of descent from the gods, as in a thousand others, the Romans borrowed from the Greeks. Suetonius in his *History of Augustus* does not hesitate to ascribe to Apollo the paternity of the great Emperor; and Vergil, a century earlier, called him an offspring of Jupiter.

These illustrations are sufficient to show that the Greek world had long been familiar with the belief that great men spring from the gods. Whether we think with Justin that the Greeks and Romans were led to this belief by "wicked demons," or regard it, somewhat more charitably, as a sincere religious attempt to account for the mystery of extraordinary personalities, the fact itself remains.

Now when one reflects that the Christian Church after the destruction of Jerusalem was very largely, perhaps we might say *essentially*, a church made up of Greek-

speaking people; when also one reflects that this conception of physical descent from gods in the case of great men was as characteristic of the Greeks in the first century as the thought of Evolution is of the present generation, and when, finally, one considers that the earliest Gospel left the origin and childhood of Jesus a blank, and so an open field for speculation, it cannot appear strange that Gentile converts claimed a miraculous birth for that teacher and wonder-worker whose wisdom and might far transcended those of all other great men. From the Greek point of view this result was almost inevitable.

They who originated the stories of the birth of Jesus doubtless believed that they were writing what was true. The supernatural conception was for them a natural, if not necessary, inference from the stupendous results of the teaching of Jesus. A man whose name had penetrated the entire empire of Rome in less than a century and had called into being almost countless societies of disciples *must*—as it would have seemed to them—have sprung directly from God. Hence it is not likely that it occurred to them to search for contemporary *evidence* of the truth of their belief. Moreover it was not an age which was given to investigating the historical grounds of its beliefs. This particular article of belief was simply a part of the Greek heritage, and in the thought of Gentile believers it needed no other support than that which any one could find in abundance in the victories which were daily being achieved in the name of Jesus.

And the originators of the story not only believed it to be essentially true to fact, they also, beyond question, felt that this story rendered to Jesus a just meed of honor. Wide circles must have shared this feeling, for not otherwise could we explain how it came to be incorporated in the narratives of Matthew and Luke.

But in this matter of the supernatural origin of Jesus the modern view differs from that of the early Greek Christians. We do not seek to account for great personalities, even for the greatest known among men, in the way they did. To us God appears as a God of order,

who invariably honors his own laws and institutions. Doubtless the person of Jesus still has its profound mysteries, but these are not illuminated for us by the Greek solution. That only begets fresh mysteries. But, finally, it cannot be said of the age that is beginning to reject the Greek story of the miraculous conception of Jesus that it is less concerned to honor him than were those unknown believers who first gave currency to that story. No age has ever given to Jesus more intelligent and sincere homage than is being rendered by the present. But our world is widely different from that of the first century, and some things that seemed natural then are for us irrational and impossible.

CHAPTER II

LEGENDS OF THE MINISTRY OF JESUS

To discriminate in an absolute manner between the historical and the legendary in our synoptic Gospels, to point out the exact amount of historical material in any doubtful narrative, will probably always be impossible. It is certainly not the purpose of this chapter to attempt such a task. But the impossibility of an absolute and final discrimination ought not to deter one from making any discrimination at all. Loyalty to Jesus ought to make every disciple eager to know just as far as possible where the faithful portrait of the Master has been overlaid with later material, no matter how dear that material may have become through long and unquestioned use.

It is a fact of much importance that, as respects legendary accretions, the story of the public ministry of Jesus differs widely both from the story of his childhood and from the story of what succeeded his death. It is relatively free from such accretions. When one considers the character of the age in which the Gospel took shape, its extreme credulity and love of the supernatural, one is not surprised that the account of the public ministry of Jesus has some legendary elements in it, but rather that it has *so little* which must be called legendary.

In the preceding study of the ministry of Jesus in Part II some incidents were considered which are not free from legendary color, and which might therefore be included in the present chapter. The reason why they were considered there and why they are not classed with the material of this chapter is that the historical element in them was regarded as clear and important. Only that material is taken up in the present chapter whose historical element is obscure or even unrecognizable. The distinction between the two classes is one of degree.

The earliest Christian source—the *Logia*—contains nothing which need be regarded as in any degree legendary. The oldest Gospel—the basis of the first and third—contains perhaps no more than five incidents which are to be regarded as legendary, but there are easily double this number in the material which is peculiar to Matthew and in that which is peculiar to Luke. The Johannine tradition yet further illustrates the law that, in unhistoric ages, the growth of legend becomes more luxuriant the further one is removed in time from the subject which is being treated.

We turn first to the legendary element in the oldest Gospel. The storm on the lake, which threatened death to the apostles and to Jesus who was asleep, and the feeding of the great multitude with five loaves and two fishes have already been discussed,¹ and reason has been given for the view that the actual incident in each case was such as the spiritual resources of Jesus amply explain. We shall not here retrace that argument, but only call attention to the fact that by the legendary modification of the historical incident its *spiritual* uniqueness has been lost, and what remains is on a plane with many a story of the nations. If Jesus, when awakened out of sleep in the midst of a dangerous tempest, delivered his disciples from their terror by his own perfect calmness, and so brought them safely to the shore; and if his presence with the multitude and the outpouring of his gracious message concerning the heavenly Father made of the little food at hand a satisfying feast for all, we have therein facts of abiding significance, facts moreover which are in perfect accord with the spirituality of the method of Jesus as seen in the *Logia* and the earliest Gospel. The motive which led to the transformation of the historical incidents was probably the desire to make Jesus outshine all other wonder-workers, or that transformation was due to the view of the person of Jesus which, contrary to his own words about himself, arose and flourished in the Early Church.

¹ See pp. 177-179.

Another incident in the oldest Gospel,¹ followed by Matthew and John,² is that of Jesus walking upon the lake.

One who comes to this story from a study of the *Logia*—that collection of the words of Jesus which doubtless gives us our most trustworthy picture of his mind and method—seems to be in a different sphere. The law of spiritual means for spiritual ends is dropped, and we have instead the use of most extraordinary physical means for a spiritual end.³ We have an event precisely of that character which Jesus, in the wilderness, when contemplating the great work which had been opened before him, positively refused to employ. He there rejected forever that conception of Messiahship which called for outward material proofs, miraculous in nature. But here he is said to have walked on the water and thereby to have brought his disciples to the confession, "Of a truth thou art the Son of God!" Did he then really abandon the high ground which he took at the beginning of his public ministry and drop into the popular conception of the Messiah, or should we rather conclude that the popular conception has here modified some striking historical incident? The second alternative seems immeasurably the more probable. The other alternative has against it not only the great weight of the *Logia*, but also certain details of the text itself, which we will now consider. We need not dwell on the fact that the three accounts of the incident have each one its own geographical setting, the oldest Gospel saying that the disciples started for Bethsaida⁴ and finally anchored at Gennesaret,⁵ Matthew that they started for the "other side"⁶—whichever that may have been—and came to Gennesaret,⁷ and John that they started for Capernaum⁸ and ultimately reached there,⁹ though this vagueness is not favorable to the complete trustworthiness of the tradition. Passing this

¹ Mk. 6:45-52; Mt. 14:22-27, 32-33.

² Jn. 6:16-21.

³ That Matthew understood the story to teach spiritual truth is plain from 14:33. It is implied also in Mk. 6:52. Moreover there is no reasonable ground for thinking that these old fishermen would have been drowned had there not been a miraculous intervention on their behalf.

⁴ Mk. 6:45.

⁷ Mt. 14:34.

⁵ Mk. 6:53.

⁸ Jn. 6:17.

⁶ Mt. 14:22.

⁹ Jn. 6:21.

we will briefly note two points which concern the kernel of the present narrative more closely.

The oldest Gospel, speaking from the standpoint of those on the boat, says that Jesus "would have passed by them,"¹ that is, they saw him moving parallel with their own course. This point is dropped by Matthew, and in John we have a contradictory statement, viz. that Jesus was *drawing nigh* unto the boat.² Now this detail of the oldest Gospel seems out of harmony with the rest of the present story, for which reason it may have been dropped by Matthew and John. This lack of harmony suggests that the detail in question may be a survival of an earlier form of the tradition. If Jesus was indeed walking on the water for the relief of his disciples, then the view of John that he *approached* the boat is certainly preferable to that of Mark that he "would have passed by them," for this detail only heightens the spectacular nature of the act; but if he was on the shore, walking toward their common destination according to his previous agreement with them,³ then these words of the oldest Gospel are perfectly intelligible. Again, the way in which the narratives of Mark and Matthew conclude should not be overlooked. According to Mark, the effect of the whole incident on the disciples was a silent amazement,⁴ in which the author saw spiritual obtuseness;⁵ but according to Matthew, the effect was an outspoken confession which implied not spiritual *obtuseness* but spiritual *illumination*. This divergence is certainly more in the manner of legend than of history. Legend is relatively free, history relatively bound.

We come now to the story of the metamorphosis (transfiguration) of Jesus.⁶ Perhaps the chief if not only reason why any of us think of this as an actual historical occurrence is that we find it in the Gospels, and we have been brought up in ignorance of the fact that the Gospels contain much besides history. Such a story found anywhere else—a story telling how a man's face

¹ Mk. 6:48.

² Jn. 6:19.

³ Mk. 6:45 (προάγειν).

⁴ Mk. 6:51.

⁵ Mk. 6:52.

⁶ Mk. 9:2-8; Mt. 17:1-9; Lk. 9:28-36.

shone as the sun, and his garments became glistening white, how other men who had been dead long centuries came and talked with him, and how an articulate voice came out of a cloud—would at once, without the slightest hesitation, be regarded as a legend.

But this is found in the midst of incidents which are unquestionably historical, and concerns the most extraordinary of all men. May it not therefore be historical? Let us see. The episode of Moses and Elijah is partially explained, for Luke says that these men spoke to Jesus of his approaching death in Jerusalem.¹ The oldest Gospel says simply that they "talked with him;"² but when it adds that the disciples were charged not to tell what they had seen until after the Son of Man should have *arisen from the dead*,³ it suggests at least that the subject of conversation on the mountain may have been such as Luke mentions. But what did it mean that Moses and Elijah talked with Jesus of his approaching death in Jerusalem? The fact that the narrative does not tell *what* they said, or how they regarded this approaching event, deprives the incident of all possible value for the readers *unless* it be held that the Old Testament itself, represented by Moses and Elijah, tells us what they must have said. Hence we cannot doubt that the evangelists in saying that Moses and Elijah talked with Jesus of his approaching death *assumed* that what they said could be found in Scripture, when this was read in the light of the resurrection. We are also doubtless safe in saying that, in the thought of the narrators, Moses and Elijah did not talk with Jesus for *his* instruction: their conception of Jesus excludes such dependence. If not for his instruction, it must have been for the instruction of the disciples.

Now two considerations suggest themselves at this point. First, that the attitude of Jesus toward the Old Testament, judged by the clearest light which the Gospels throw upon it, does not warrant the view that he used either the peculiar circumstances of the death of

¹ Lk. 9:31.

² Mk. 9:4.

³ Mk. 9:9.

Moses and Elijah, or the words attributed to them in the Old Testament, to prove that he was about to die in Jerusalem, or that he *must* die there. Second, it is not in agreement with the teaching of Jesus who said that he came to *fulfil* the law and the prophets to suppose that he would have summoned Moses and Elijah to instruct *his* disciples. Why should he? Might not one say—adapting to this end the parable of Jesus: If the disciples would not believe the word of the Master regarding the necessity of his death, neither would they believe though Moses and Elijah should rise from the dead to declare it to them?

The episode of Moses and Elijah is followed by that of the voice out of the cloud. There is no evident connection between them. According to Luke,¹ Moses and Elijah had already vanished² before the heavenly voice was heard. The voice out of the cloud was not for Jesus, but for the disciples. They are expressly told to hear him. The injunction is perfectly general, but its place in this story may suggest that it refers especially to what Jesus says of his death. Thus it would seem to be meant as a re-inforcement of the teaching of the last episode, for surely the evangelists did not suppose there was any disagreement between the heavenly visitants and Jesus. The disciples are not bidden to hear *him* in contrast to Moses and Elijah, but simply to hear him. He had recently spoken to them of his impending death,³ and now they have heard Moses and Elijah address him on that very subject. Obviously then the doctrine of the Messiah's death was not new and questionable, but ancient and divine. Such would seem to be the sense of the story.

Against the historical character of this episode, as of the last, one consideration of great weight is the subsequent course of events. Had these three disciples been supernaturally informed that the death of Jesus was a doctrine of the Law and Prophets, and had they been

¹ Lk. 9:33.

² They were in the act of vanishing when Peter began to speak about the "booths."

³ Mk. 8:31.

commanded by the voice of God himself to hear Jesus, that is, receive his words about his approaching death, then it is difficult to believe that they could afterward have been in fear and ignorance when he spoke of his approaching death.¹

But while this story is thus seemingly unintelligible as history, it is not difficult to comprehend it as an attempt—parallel to Luke 24—to ground the death of the Messiah in the Scriptures. How could this have been done, in the latter half of the first century, more vividly than by summoning Moses and Elijah—representatives of the Law and the Prophets—and by letting them talk with Jesus of his approaching death in Jerusalem? And how could the divinity of the doctrine of the Messiah's death be suggested so impressively for that age as by a direct voice from the sky commanding the disciples to hear Jesus, where the context seems to refer in particular to hearing what he says on this very subject? We must not forget that the death of Jesus was for the Jews the great "stumbling-block"² in the way of accepting him as the Messiah. Hence the insistence of the early Church upon the *scripturalness* of the doctrine, and the desire to find it enunciated by Jesus.

Of Matthew's peculiar material which falls within the present chapter only two incidents involve Jesus in a personal way; the others belong to his trial and to the period between that and the resurrection. The first of these two incidents is that of Peter's walking on the water,³ which is inserted in the story of how Jesus came to his disciples when they were distressed in rowing.⁴ If that story is legendary, as we seem compelled to hold, then is this also, and for the same essential reason. It conflicts with the known principles and method of Jesus. It represents him as working an astounding miracle, utterly unlike his mighty works, and for no apparent reason unless it was that his disciples might believe him to be the Messiah,⁵ but such a deed is fairly excluded by the teaching of the wilderness experience. It may be

¹ Mk. 9:32; Lk. 18:34.

² E.g., I Cor. 1:23.

³ Mt. 14:28-33.

⁴ Mk. 6:45-52.

⁵ Mt. 14:33.

added that this story of Peter's adventure is evidently dependent upon the view that Jesus *himself* was at that moment walking on the water, for had Peter supposed him to be on the shore, and had he desired to reach him, we should rather have expected him to cast himself into the water and swim ashore¹ than request Jesus to help him out miraculously. But if there is no sufficient reason for believing that Jesus walked on the water, then the other and dependent story must be regarded as a legend.

The other Matthaean incident which belongs here is that of the coin in the fish's mouth.² Jesus with his apostles had come down to Capernaum from the region of Caesarea Philippi. While there, Peter was approached by those who collected the temple dues and asked whether his teacher did not pay the half-shekel. Jesus, cognisant of what had taken place, anticipated Peter's request, as he came up, with the argument that kings do not receive tribute from their own sons. Then he added that, lest they should cause others to "stumble," Peter should give the collectors a shekel, and that he would find this money in the mouth of the first fish which he should catch in the lake.

The difference between this story and the stories of the ordinary mighty works of Jesus is too obvious to need much comment. It is the difference between reason and unreason, between a sane moral method and an arbitrary unmoral, if not immoral, one. If Jesus, when in the wilderness, refused to attempt a miracle to satisfy his hunger, or even to assure himself of God's care of the Messiah, we cannot believe that he here undertook a miracle to pay a tax of some thirty cents for himself and as much for Peter. The thing is not only altogether inconsistent with his action in the wilderness, but it is quite devoid of any adequate ground. Peter could easily earn enough to pay the tax, supposing—which we hardly have a right to do, that he had no money whatever, not even two shillings; not only so, but the friends who ministered to Jesus' support at other times would gladly have served him in this trifling need.

¹ Cf. Jn. 21:7.

² Mt. 17:24-27.

In Luke's peculiar material there are two¹ incidents of the ministry of Jesus which belong in the present chapter. One of these is the raising of the son of a widow who lived in Nain.² This is not parallel to the story of the daughter of Jairus. Perhaps the incident *itself* was like that, but the present story is different. That was a case of resuscitating a person wrongly given up as dead, this a case of restoring the dead to life. The young man was at least accounted to be dead, and the body was being borne to its burial. Jesus came nigh, touched the bier, and said, "Young man, I say unto thee, arise." It is possible that he saw, as in the case of the daughter of Jairus, that the young man was only in a swoon, or in a death-like stupor. This supposition is somewhat strengthened by another incident which Luke gives in his second "treatise."³ He says there of the young man Eutychus, who had fallen from a third-story window, that he was taken up "dead;" but when Paul came down stairs and saw the youth, he said, "Make ye no ado; for *his life is in him.*" So in the present case, though Luke may have believed that the young man was dead, *Jesus* may have perceived, as Paul did in the other instance, that death had not come. This, we say, *may* have been the actual fact, and hence what Jesus did was to resuscitate a person who lay in a death-like condition; but the narrative before us appears, on its face, to tell of the raising of a dead man to life. Can we accept it at its apparent face-value? We must answer, in the light of what Jesus himself says, and in the light of the clearest tradition of his work, that we can not. Jesus rejected, in the wilderness, the popular Messianic rôle, and chose the simple quiet method of spiritual influence. He refused to give the Pharisees "signs" from heaven. But what more stupendous "sign" could he have given than to halt a funeral procession and by a mere word restore the dead to life! I will not raise the idle question whether Jesus

¹ The passage 22:43-44 is not taken into account as the text is uncertain. —Lk. 10:1 and 17:11-19 are possibly legendary developments of the mission of the Twelve and the cure of the leper in Mk. 1:40.

² Lk. 7:11-17.

³ Acts 20:9-12.

could have wrought such a result; the question is simply whether our sources allow us to believe that he *would* have done it. To this question we must give a negative reply. It remains only to add that in an age ignorant of medicine, which was also a wonder-loving age, it would obviously have been very easy to make out of the resuscitation of a person who *seemed* to be dead the resurrection of one who had actually expired.

Luke's second incident is that of healing the high-priest's servant.¹ His ear had been severed from his head by a blow from a sword: Jesus "touched his ear and healed him." The verb does not imply that Jesus gave the man a new ear in the place of the one cut off. We cannot say whether the writer so thought of the healing. But even if he did not suppose that the member was restored, he certainly thought of the ugly wound as healed by a touch. The objections to regarding this as historical are not remote. In the first place, Jesus had for weeks systematically refrained from his customary "mighty works." Second, those mighty works were conditioned on faith in him; but can we reasonably suppose that this servant, sent with others to arrest Jesus and now maimed by one of his disciples, had faith in him! That is surely too improbable to warrant serious consideration. Third, the mighty works of Jesus were intelligible; this is not. Jesus was uniquely equipped to heal the body through the mind; we have no evidence that he was equipped to heal the body in any other way. In restoring the body through the mind, as in restoring the mind itself, he acted in harmony with the nature of things; but in staunching the flow of blood by a touch and healing thus the wound where an entire member had been cut off, he did not act in harmony with the nature of things, but rather with profound disregard of physical laws.

The change of atmosphere as we pass now from the synoptic story of the ministry of Jesus to that of John is unmistakably announced by the way in which certain synoptic incidents are here retold. The first of these is

¹ Lk. 22:51.

the account of the cure of an officer's son in Capernaum.¹ That this is a variant version of the synoptists' story of the healing of a centurion's servant seems to be required by certain conspicuous points of agreement. Thus in both cases the man who sought help was a foreigner, in both cases he was located in Capernaum, in both cases Jesus was at a distance and remained at a distance from the man's house, and in both cases the man, though a foreigner, had remarkable trust in Jesus. It seems highly improbable that there were two foreign officials in Capernaum whose need, whose relation to Jesus, and whose approach to him were so strikingly alike. But the supernatural element in the later story marks a decided advance upon that of the older narrative. Thus, in Matthew and Luke, Jesus, though at a distance from the centurion's house, is yet in the same village of Capernaum; in John, he is some twenty miles away in Cana; in Luke, the servant was found whole when the messengers returned; in John, it is particularly stated that just when Jesus, in Cana, spoke the healing word, the fever left its victim in Capernaum; and finally, while in Matthew and Luke nothing is said of the effect of the cure upon others, it is said in John that the man and his whole house "believed," that is, believed in the Messiahship of Jesus—a result which, in the synoptists, is never said to follow a cure.

A second incident which is signally modified in John is that of Jesus walking on the lake.² We will note here, as in the other case, only those points of difference which intensify the supernatural element of the story. It is said that the disciples had rowed twenty-five or thirty furlongs, that is, approximately half way to Capernaum. Consequently they were about in the middle of the lake with reference to this village and the point of departure on the "other side:" they were halfway across where the lake is about eight miles wide. Thus the writer appears to exclude the possibility that Jesus, when seen by the boat's company, was walking along the shore. If now

¹ Jn. 4:46-54.

² Jn. 6:16-21.

he had followed in their wake, he had walked on the water twenty-five or thirty furlongs; and if he had come out to them from the nearest point of the shore, he had walked nearly as far.

Another significant point in John's version of the incident is that when the disciples had received Jesus into the boat, "straightway the boat was at the land whither they were going." The winds and waves are not quieted, but the boat is now no longer hindered by them. Instantaneously the remaining miles of water are passed, and the haven is reached.

If now the writer of the last Gospel did not hesitate thus to heighten the supernatural element in the narrative of these synoptic incidents which had long been known in the churches and which, we should suppose, must have been regarded as somewhat fixed, it would not be surprising if, in handling material that is unknown to the synoptic Gospels, and known to us only in his own version, he should depart even further from the early Gospels in the matter of the supernatural.

There are four¹ such incidents in his Gospel. We are here concerned with these incidents not as the vehicles of ethical or spiritual teaching, but merely with regard to the prior question whether they are historical.

There is, first, the changing of water into wine at a marriage in Cana of Galilee.² Read as history, this involves us in a hopeless conflict with the oldest Gospel. We will not dwell upon the fact that Jesus is already said to have had "disciples," though it was but the third day since he had left the Jordan,³ nor upon the author's statement that the turning of water into wine was the *first* sign of Jesus,⁴ while according to the synoptists the first was the cure of a demoniac in Capernaum;⁵ but we will come at once to matters which are fundamental. And first, when the wine provided for the entertainment failed, the mother of Jesus said to him, "They have no wine."⁶ It is apparent both from the construction which Jesus put

¹ Not including that of the supplementary twenty-first chapter.

² Jn. 2:1-4.

³ Jn. 2:11.

⁴ Jn. 2:11.

⁵ Mk. 1:23.

⁶ Jn. 2:3.

upon these words¹ and from the subsequent remark of Mary to the servants² that she meant them as a suggestion that Jesus should intervene in a supernatural manner for the relief of the painful situation. But this attitude of Mary is excluded by the representation of the oldest Gospel, according to which, some weeks later than the marriage in Cana, she thought her son was "beside himself" because of his mighty works and his preaching.³ The two attitudes are plainly contradictory: both cannot be historical. If Mary expected supernatural help from Jesus in Cana, then she can not have sought to interrupt his work a few weeks later when he was relieving far deeper needs than the need of wine at Cana, and was doing it in part by mighty works.

Again, it is said that, as a result of this sign at Cana, the disciples of Jesus "believed" on him,⁴ that is, believed him to be the Messiah, which is the invariable meaning of the term in the Fourth Gospel. But according to the synoptists the disciples did not come to believe in Jesus as Messiah until about the close of the Galilean ministry. These representations too are mutually exclusive. But let us come now to the "sign" itself. Six stone jars were filled with water at Jesus' command,⁵ and when their contents were tasted by the ruler of the feast he declared that it was wine and more choice than what they had already drunk.⁶ The author's meaning is unmistakable: Jesus was equipped with omnipotence. But the difficulty in the way of accepting this incident is insurmountable. Jesus is here represented as acting upon a principle which, while he was in the wilderness, he had utterly rejected. He here manifests his "glory" by a stupendous sign, that is to say, he proceeds in exactly the way in which the Messiah, according to the popular expectation, was to proceed. Not a word is said of teaching, as though it too were a part of his "hour."⁷ His "glory" is manifested exclusively by the "sign," and this was of a character fitted to overwhelm the beholder. But this

¹ Jn. 2:4.

² Jn. 2:5.

³ Mk. 3:21, 31.

⁴ Jn. 2:11.

⁵ Jn. 2:6-7.

⁶ Jn. 2:10.

⁷ Jn. 2:4.

method of reaching the Messianic goal was regarded by Jesus in the wilderness as a temptation of Satan.

Now it is impossible that Jesus was thus fickle, that at one time he most positively turned from a certain conception of Messiahship, and again, after a few days, acted on that very conception as though he had always held it. It is not thus that he came to the spiritual leadership of the world.

Another grave difficulty in the way of accepting this incident as historical is that it implies a conception of the resources of Jesus which is contradicted by the *Logia* and the oldest Gospel. For there, as has been shown, his equipment is spiritual: it is a unique knowledge of the character of God and the conviction of a unique mission to make this character known; but here we are made acquainted with an extraordinary equipment which is *not* spiritual—an equipment of almighty power. This equipment follows naturally from the author's general view of Jesus as the incarnation of the Logos, but it is just as obviously irreconcilable with the view of the oldest sources.

The second of the four incidents under discussion is that which occurred at the Bethesda pool in Jerusalem.¹ This was a water-cure, and a multitude of sick people were present in the porches when Jesus visited the place. Some were blind, some lame and some palsied. One man had been in his infirmity thirty-eight years. Jesus singled him out of the multitude, and asked him if he would be made whole. The man did not say yes, but told how it happened that he had not yet secured health. He was always a little late in reaching the pool when the water was "troubled," that is, when it had curative virtue. Jesus then told him to arise, take up his bed, and walk, which the man at once did.

We will not dwell on the fact that our synoptic Gospels represent Jesus as averse to working so-called "mighty works" after his second and longer visit in Capernaum, and that they do not agree in locating a single cure in

¹ Jn. 5:1-9.

Jerusalem; but we will at once consider some points which are more fundamental.

First, it is quite strange to our oldest sources that Jesus should take the initiative, as here, and ask a sick man if he wished to be made whole. According to those sources, Jesus never healed except as people came, or were brought, to him, and sought healing. That fact is in obvious accord with the representation of the oldest sources that Jesus regarded himself primarily as a revealer of God rather than as a healer of men's bodies. For him to go into a hospital or water-cure and ask a sick man if he wished to be made whole was certainly to give his healing ministry a new and striking prominence.

Second, the representation of the oldest sources is that the cures of Jesus were invariably wrought by faith—faith in him as able to heal, but here, in the Bethesda incident, there is no indication whatever that the sick person had faith in the man who asked him the strange question, nor is there the slightest trace of a desire on Jesus' part that the man should exercise faith. He simply asked him if he wanted to be made whole.

And finally, there is no instance in the oldest sources where Jesus worked *incognito*. All who sought his help knew him as Jesus, the teacher and healer. But here, in the Johannine story, he is a total stranger to the man who is healed. That person did not know even the *name* of his benefactor.¹ There was therefore no possibility of his being affected by the great reputation of Jesus as a worker of cures.

Now these three striking peculiarities in the story of the Bethesda cure all conspire to mark it off as a work of sheer omnipotence. Jesus seeks out a sick man—the most unpromising case, apparently, in the entire multitude of sick people present, for the man had been thirty-eight years in his infirmity—and without making himself known and without the aid of trust on the part of the sick man, he gives him the gift of wholeness. The entire incident is thus so radically unlike the typical cures

¹ Jn. 5:13.

of Jesus according to the oldest sources that it cannot be accepted as on the same plane with them.

The third sign peculiar to John is that of the healing of a man who was born blind.¹ As in the Bethesda incident, so here also Jesus takes the initiative, and here too nothing is said of trust. Jesus was in Jerusalem, and seeing a blind beggar, he took him in hand and healed him. The incident is introduced as a confirmation of the word which Jesus had just spoken—"I am the light of the world."² The man knew indeed that his benefactor's name was Jesus,³ but that seems to have been all that he knew. After he had been healed, he inferred that Jesus must be a prophet, and when Jesus, a little later, disclosed to him that he was the Son of God, he promptly accepted him as such.⁴

One feature of this story is like what is sometimes met in the synoptists, viz. that Jesus made use of physical means in healing the man,⁵ and this fact may suggest a historical nucleus. But this feature appears to be out of harmony with the rest of the story, for this implies that the cure depended on the man's obedience to the word of Jesus, while according to the introduction it is presented rather as an illustration of his *sovereign* power. As regards this feature then the story is to be classed with the Bethesda incident, though taken as a whole it does not depart so widely from the synoptic type.

The last incident which we have to consider is that of raising Lazarus.⁶ This is as foreign to the typical mighty work of the oldest sources as are the Cana and Bethesda incidents. Equally with the Cana incident it runs squarely counter to the Messianic conception which Jesus adopted in the wilderness. He there rejected the popular conception of a material Messiahship which involved supernatural manifestations, but here he deliberately proceeds to the most stupendous of all his reputed signs, and does it that men may believe him to be the Messiah.⁷ He even orders his course to the end that the

¹ Jn. 9.

² Jn. 9:5.

³ Jn. 9:11.

⁴ Jn. 9:35-38.

⁵ See, e.g., Mk. 8:23.

⁶ Jn. 11:1-44.

⁷ Jn. 11:15, 42.

impressiveness of the sign may be enhanced. Thus he remains two days in Perea after the message has come from the sisters of Lazarus,¹ and at the tomb the thanksgiving to the Father is for the sake of the multitude who stand by.² This feature forms as sharp a contrast as possible to the synoptic representation that Jesus, even early in the Galilean ministry, avoided publicity in his mighty works.

The contrast of results is also most striking. Here *many* of the Jews were brought by the sign to a belief in the Messiahship of Jesus,³ while in the synoptic narrative such a belief is never said to have resulted from the mighty works of Jesus.

The deed itself forms an obvious advance on the incident in the home of Jairus and that outside the village of Nain. From the resuscitation of a person wrongly supposed to be dead we pass to the raising of one who was about to be buried, and from that to the tomb of one who had been dead four days. Here at last all doubt of Jesus' power to raise the dead is to be obliterated. This seems to be the purpose of the narrative, which is only another way of saying that it is designed as an illustration of the truth of the words to Martha, "I am the resurrection and the life."⁴ Those words are beyond doubt profoundly true. The spirit of Jesus has raised a considerable portion of humanity to a new and higher life, and we who follow him believe that this spirit will ultimately elevate the entire race. But the illustration of the truth of these words which we have in the resurrection of Lazarus, when studied in the light of the oldest sources, cannot be regarded otherwise than as an illustration freely constructed for the purpose. As such it may well have been effective in a wonder-loving age, but in an age which is beginning to reverence the Master far more than it reverences any man's *conception* of the Master, this illustration is seen to obscure and confuse the original portrait.

We have now completed our survey of those incidents

¹ Jn. 11:6.

² Jn. 11:42.

³ Jn. 11:45.

⁴ Jn. 11:25.

belonging to the narrative of the public ministry of Jesus which, judged in the light of what Jesus said of himself and his mission, in the light also of the typical mighty works which he wrought, seem to us to be predominantly legendary in character.

We have seen that our sources reveal with perfect clearness a gradual increase in the amount of legendary matter, and to some extent also a gradual heightening or intensification of the legendary character. The *Logia*-source is wholly free from legendary accretions. This is the less remarkable of course in view of the fact that it is a collection of the *words* of Jesus, but still it is significant, for it is not exclusively a document of words but contains also some incidents, and what is more, it has references to the character of Jesus' ministry which are quite as important for the point under discussion as any narrative of mighty works would be. Passing from the *Logia* to the oldest Gospel we find some legendary matter, but in nearly every instance the historical basis is not difficult of recognition. This group of passages may be illustrated by the story of Jesus' walking on the water. Then we come to that considerable body of material which is peculiar either to Matthew or to Luke, and we find here, in the aggregate, a relatively larger element of legendary matter and it is also of a more intense sort. This class may be illustrated by the incident of the coin in the fish's mouth and the story of Peter's walking on the water. Finally, in the incidents of the Johannine tradition, we have the widest departure from the oldest Gospel both in the relative amount of legendary matter and in its character. The number of "signs" is less than the number of mighty works in the triple tradition, but the relative space which they occupy is more than twice as great as that taken by mighty works in Matthew and is slightly greater than the space occupied by mighty works even in Mark.¹ The most striking fact, however, is that, whereas less than twenty-five *per cent.* of the

¹ About twelve per cent of Matthew's Gospel is taken up with mighty works and about twenty-six per cent of Mark, but in John about twenty-nine per cent is given to signs.

mighty works in Mark need be regarded as showing any influence of legend, there is not *one* in John which is *free* from such influence. In character also, the Johannine signs depart further from the typical mighty works of the synoptists than do the legendary incidents that are found in those narratives. This is seen in the fact that some of these signs, like the incident of the raising of Lazarus, have no recognizable historical element, while such an element may be found in the legendary incidents of the synoptists, even in the incident of the coin in the mouth of a fish.

In closing this chapter on the legendary element in the narrative of the public ministry of Jesus let me revert to a thought expressed at the outset, that loyalty to the Founder of our faith demands such an investigation as we have made. It is not a matter which concerns scholars alone. If the conclusions of this chapter are true, they are of practical importance to every Christian disciple, for whatever affects, even in the slightest degree, our conception of the character and life of Jesus thereby affects the central historical fact in our religion. If the conclusions of this chapter are valid, then our sources do make possible the restoration of a picture of the activity of Jesus which is self-consistent and harmonious.

CHAPTER III

THE LEGEND OF A MATERIAL RESURRECTION

WHAT, if anything, did Jesus ever say of his own resurrection? The oldest source—the *Logia*—is silent on this question. It has no word of Jesus either regarding his death or his resurrection.¹ This is remarkable in view of the large place which the story of his resurrection has occupied in the life and teaching of the Church. But the *Logia* has one point of great interest respecting the resurrection of Jesus. This is Matthew's version of the sign of Jonah.² We see here how the story of the resurrection of Jesus sought for justification in the words of Jesus, which he had spoken while on earth. There can be no doubt that Luke has preserved the original sense of the Master's allusion to Jonah.³ But this was not satisfactory to one who like the author of the first Gospel sought to establish a close and detailed correspondence between the life of Jesus and the Old Testament. He therefore put Jonah's parallelism to Jesus in his three days' experience in the belly of the great fish.⁴ True, this did not exactly agree with the form of the resurrection story which he in common with Luke adopted, according to which the Lord rose not after three days and three nights but after *two*⁵ nights, yet the striking passage in Jonah could not be disregarded simply on account of this discrepancy.

Thus our oldest source not only gives no word of Jesus in regard to his own resurrection, but it seems to contain in Matthew's version of the words about Jonah

¹ See pp. 22-23 on Mt. 12:38-42.

² Mt. 12:38-42.

³ See pp. 22-23.

⁴ Jonah 1:17.

⁵ Jesus was crucified on Friday and his resurrection is placed on Sunday morning.

clear evidence of an early attempt to supply the *lack* of authentic teaching on this point.

When we come to the triple tradition we find two classes of utterances of Jesus in regard to his fate. We have, in the first place, a number of plain allusions to his death unaccompanied with any reference to resurrection. Thus in the defence of his disciples, when they disregarded the customary fasts, he likened them to the sons of the bride-chamber, and said that days would come when the bridegroom would be taken from them.¹ Again, on the last evening, in the disclosure of the traitor, he said, "The Son of Man goes, as it has been written concerning him."² Later, during the supper, he alluded variously to his death."³

But, in the second place, we find other passages in which the thought of death is followed by that of resurrection. There are, as is well known, three of these passages. Of these three the first⁴ which for that very reason must be supposed to have impressed itself most deeply on the minds of the hearers, does not attempt to give the *very words* of Jesus, but only the substance of what he said. And even in regard to this there seems to have been no certain knowledge, no fixed tradition, for the version of Matthew and Luke departs from that of Mark, being influenced apparently by the story of the resurrection. Instead of Mark's "three days," Matthew and Luke have the "third day,"⁵ and instead of Mark's active verb "rise," they have the passive "be raised."⁶ The former detail accords with the story of the resurrection according to which Jesus was buried Friday at evening and arose early on the second morning there-after; and the use of the passive by Matthew and Luke agrees with the view, clearly expressed in Matthew (28:2), that the resurrection was initiated and carried out from above. But since the second and third evan-

¹ Mk. 2:20; Mt. 9:15; Lk. 5:35.

² Mk. 14:21; Mt. 26:24; Lk. 22:22.

³ Mk. 14:22, 25; Mt. 26:26, 29; Lk. 22:19, 18.

⁴ Mk. 8:31; Mt. 16:21; Lk. 9:22.

⁵ Mt. 16:21; Lk. 9:22.

⁶ Mk. has ἀναστῆναι, Matthew and Luke have ἐγερθῆναι.

gelists handled this part of the earliest narrative with such freedom, we must conclude that for them and the circles which they represented *there was no explicit word of Jesus touching his bodily resurrection.*

There is moreover in the earliest Gospel itself evidence that what Jesus said of his "resurrection" was, at the time, unintelligible to the disciples. It is said, after the *second* announcement of death and resurrection, that they understood not the saying and feared to ask about it.¹ This word naturally reflects how the matter appeared to them in later times, in the light of the resurrection story. Evidently what Jesus had said did not point necessarily to an empty grave and an obvious victory over death, for in that case they would not have "feared," but would have rejoiced.

We are then at liberty to ask what Jesus meant by his word about rising after three days, and the narrative of the oldest Gospel does not leave us helpless. It contains another word of Jesus which throws light on this saying about a resurrection after three days.

Soon after the first announcement of death, or perhaps on the same occasion when that was made, Jesus said that some of those present should not taste death until they should see the kingdom of God manifested in power.² He had spoken of his death, he had spoken of the hard way his disciples must go, but another scene arose before his inner eye, a scene of victory. And the reality was not far removed; some of those present would live to see it.

Now by this passage we may interpret that other of which it is said that the disciples did not understand it and were afraid to make inquiry. There as here Jesus spoke of his death, and then of a rising after three days. This number may have been used by him, as it is often used in Scripture,³ to denote the full or appointed time, and thus it would agree with the statement of time in Mk. 9:1. The "rising"—if we define it by the clearer word of Mk. 9:1—is the opposite of defeat: it is triumph,

¹ Mk. 9:32; Lk. 9:45.

² Mk. 9:1.

³ Ex. 2:2; Josh. 2:22; I Kings 12:5; Is. 20:3.

here his *personal* triumph; and there is no distinction to be made between that and the powerful establishment of the kingdom of God.

Turning from the *Logia* and the triple tradition to certain material which is common to Mark and Matthew, there are two passages to be considered. First, there is the word spoken in Bethany, on the occasion of his being anointed.¹ Jesus said that what the woman had done, who poured the precious ointment on his head, was in preparation for his "burial." The word does not imply, of course, that no further funeral rite would be given to his body, but it does seem to imply that the speaker thought of his body as about to share the fortune common to all bodies from which the spirits have departed.

In striking contrast with this saying is the second to which reference was made. After Jesus with his disciples had left the upper room, on the last night, he is said to have announced that all would be "offended"—all those who were with him—and then to have quoted Zechariah 13:7 in support of this word.² Over against this sad discomfiture and scattering of the disciples another and comforting scene is depicted in the words: "Howbeit after I am raised up I will go before you into Galilee."

There are some weighty reasons for regarding this passage in Mark as a late addition from Matthew—a case of the assimilation of one narrative to the other. First, it is characteristic of Matthew to point out detailed agreement between the life of Jesus and Old Testament passages, while in Mark this feature is quite inconspicuous. Indeed it is doubtful whether there is a single passage in Mark—the present being excepted—in which Jesus himself points to a particular Scripture as fulfilled in him.³ The second reason is that, while in the three passages where all the synoptists⁴ refer to a resurrection, Mark always uses one Greek word (*ἀνίστημι*) and Matthew always another (*ἐγείρω*), here Mark has Matthew's

¹ Mk. 14:8; Mt. 26:12.

² Mk. 14:27; Mt. 26:31.

³ Mk. 14:21 does not refer to any particular O. T. word and 14:62 does not quote Daniel though alluding to it. Mk. 12:10 is a possible exception.

⁴ Except Luke 9:44.

term. And finally, it is only Matthew's Gospel that has a resurrection story in harmony with this reputed saying of Jesus. His one appearance of the risen Jesus to the apostles is in *Galilee*.¹

For these reasons we regard Mark 14:27-28 as an instance of the late conformation of his narrative to that of Matthew. Now the difficulty of regarding the passage as a genuine saying of Jesus is very great, if not insurmountable. It is hard to believe that Jesus, had he expected to renew his bodily fellowship with his disciples after his death, would have alluded to this great expectation but once, and then in an incidental manner. Moreover the word seems unintelligible. Why should he *precede* the disciples in returning to Galilee, and why return to Galilee *at all*? It is impossible to answer these questions. We can understand them as the evangelist's own introduction to the appearance of Jesus in Galilee—an appearance which he alone records—but we cannot understand them as spoken by Jesus.

Our examination of the sources has led to this result, that Jesus said nothing of a resurrection of his body from the grave. The word about "rising after three days," interpreted in the light of a kindred saying, refers not to the fortunes of his physical body but to the triumph of his cause, the establishment of the kingdom of God. It is perhaps *conceivable* that Jesus may have been inwardly assured of his bodily resurrection and yet for some reason have said nothing of it to his disciples, but it is at least very improbable. Consideration for his friends would have been a strong inducement to lead him to share with them this great assurance, if he had possessed it. Therefore we come to the story of the bodily resurrection of Jesus with a distinct presumption against its historicity, which presumption is based on the silence of Jesus. Presumption, however, is not proof, and the story still demands investigation.

The resurrection story of the oldest Gospel—seemingly incomplete since it announces, but does not record, an

¹ Mt. 28:16.

appearance of the risen Jesus¹—consists of only eight verses, which may conveniently be divided into an introduction,² the approach to the tomb,³ the scene in the tomb,⁴ and the flight from the tomb.⁵ The introduction names the women who came to the tomb, specifies the time when they bought spices and the use they purposed to make of them. As they approached the tomb, they expected to find the door closed with the great stone, and were surprised⁶ to find the stone rolled back.

The scene in the tomb is the center of the story. On their entrance into the sepulchre the women saw an angel—described as “a young man in a white robe”—and were amazed. He soothed their amazed spirits, and told them that Jesus whom they were seeking was risen, and called their attention to the place where men had laid him. Then he sent them to announce to the disciples and Peter: “He goes before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him, as he told you.” Following this word, the women fled from the tomb, for trembling and astonishment had come upon them. Moreover they said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid.

These last two clauses are somewhat vague. For how long a time did they keep their secret, and what was it that they “feared”? Certainly the writer did not mean that the secret had never been told until he wrote his narrative. The Greek tense used does not allow that view.⁷ We may suppose that this was the writer’s thought, viz. that the women, though bidden by the angel to make an announcement to the disciples, did not *at once* carry out this injunction. The ground of their silence was an undefined dread. The author *may* have supposed that they were afraid to tell what they knew lest they should be regarded as having lost their wits, or he may have meant merely that the trembling and astonish-

¹ Mk. 16:7.

² Mk. 16:1.

³ Mk. 16:2-4.

⁴ Mk. 16:5-7.

⁵ Mk. 16:8.

⁶ Surprise is involved in the words: “looking up they see that the stone is rolled back; for it was exceeding great.”

⁷ It is the aorist, not the perfect.

ment which had come upon them in the tomb made it, temporarily, impossible for them to tell what had been told them.

So far the oldest Gospel. Had we only this narrative of Mark we should be much at a loss what to believe. We can hardly avoid asking whether it is intrinsically probable. Thus, for example, is it probable that women who *realized* that they could not roll back the stone from the tomb would have gone thither *alone* on an errand requiring admission to the tomb? One of the number was Salome, whose sons James and John were in the city, and not only in the city but very probably lodging in the same house with her. Again, is it quite probable that a supernatural being would have appeared to the women in the tomb merely to repeat to them what *Jesus* had already said?¹ Then too, as the disciples were sure to return to their native Galilee and were there to see Jesus for themselves, what need was there of a supernatural messenger to inform them, by way of the women, that the word of Jesus would there be fulfilled? Finally, is it probable that three women, friends of Jesus, would have kept to themselves the joyous announcement of an angel that their Master was risen and was to be seen in Galilee? Would they not rather have urged the disciples to start at once, that they might see the fulfilment of this angelic promise?

But turning from these intrinsic difficulties of the narrative, which appear serious, we pass on to consider how Matthew and Luke handled the same incident.² An examination of this point will show the state of the tradition when these Gospels arose.

Omitting all merely formal details, Matthew's narrative, which is a trifle shorter than Mark's, agrees with it in five points and differs from it in seventeen. Luke's narrative, which is a little longer than Mark's, agrees with it in six points and differs from it in ten or eleven. The difference between Luke's narrative and that of Matthew is a little greater than the difference between it

¹ Mk. 14:28.

² Mt. 28:1-10; Lk. 24:1-7.

and Mark, there being here four points of agreement and some fourteen of disagreement.

Thus the three narratives of the same incident reveal a measure of disagreement which is without parallel in the story of any part of the public ministry of Jesus. But something more than a numerical statement is needed in order to set forth the remarkable character of the unlikeness between the various synoptic accounts of the visit which certain women made to the tomb of Jesus early on Sunday morning.

The main points in which they all agree are that at least two women went to the sepulchre, that they found the stone rolled back, and that they received there an angelic announcement that Jesus was risen. This is the extent of their common element. We come next to the differences, and first to those between Matthew and Mark. Matthew says that the women came to the tomb "late on the Sabbath day,"¹ Mark that it was on the first day of the week;² Matthew says that they came to *see* the tomb,³ making no reference at all to spices, Mark that they had bought spices in order that they might *anoint* the body;⁴ in Matthew the angel who speaks to the women is seated on the stone,⁵ in Mark he is *in* the tomb;⁶ in Matthew the women do not enter the tomb,⁷ in Mark they do;⁸ according to Matthew the message of the angel contains the words, "He is risen from the dead,"⁹ which are not in Mark; Matthew says that the women went away with fear and great *joy*,¹⁰ Mark that "trembling and astonishment" came upon them;¹¹ and finally, according to Matthew the women ran to tell the disciples,¹² while according to Mark they said nothing to any one.¹³ Of lesser significance is the fact that Matthew omits the name of Salome, and instead of "Mary the mother of James" has the singular expression "the *other* Mary." Apparently this means "the other Mary" *mentioned in Mark*, for the

¹ Mt. 28:1.

⁴ Mk. 16:1.

⁷ When the angel finishes speaking, the women go *away* from the tomb, not *out* of it.

⁸ Mk. 16:5, 8.

¹¹ Mk. 16:8.

² Mk. 16:2.

⁵ Mt. 28:2.

⁹ Mt. 28:7.

¹² Mt. 28:8.

³ Mt. 28:1.

⁶ Mk. 16:5.

¹⁰ Mt. 28:8.

¹³ Mk. 16:8.

Gospel story knows of *two* others by that name.¹ Matthew has a great earthquake,² which is seemingly caused in some manner by the angel, either by his descent out of heaven³ or by his rolling back the stone. To be noticed also is the inversion of the Marcan clauses in the message of the angel, "He is risen; he is not here."⁴ According to Matthew the angel said, "He is not here, *for* he is risen."⁵ This is not simply an inversion, but also a logical modification. The thought in the foreground is that Jesus was not there, to which, by way of explanation, is added the statement that he is risen. His body *might* have been absent from the tomb because it had been taken away.⁶ This possibility the author excludes in saying, "He is not here, *for* he is *risen*."

It is not necessary to dwell at greater length on these differences. It is obvious that the two stories, though having a common element, are mutually exclusive. They cannot be maintained side by side. They do not explain or supplement each other. They are rather contradictory. If the women came late on the Sabbath, it was not the first day of the week; if they received the angelic message outside the tomb, they did not receive it within the tomb; and if they said nothing to any one, they did not run to tell the disciples. It is evident that the writer of the first Gospel did not feel himself bound by the narrative of Mark. He appears to deal with the incident as freely as a poet deals with a given historical theme.

Consider next the narrative of Luke in its departure from Mark. Instead of three women who sought the tomb there are in Luke not only three but an indefinite number more;⁷ instead of one angel in the tomb there are here *two*;⁸ instead of seeing the angel *at once* on entering the tomb, the women are first aware that the body of the Lord is gone, and only then, while perplexed thereabout, do they see the angels;⁹ instead of reminding the women of the saying: "He goeth before you into

¹ See Mk. 6:3; Lk. 10:39.—Jn. 19:25 appears to give yet another Mary.

² Mt. 28:2.

³ Analogous to Ex. 19:18.

⁴ Mk. 16:6.

⁵ Mt. 28:6.

⁶ See Mt. 28:13.

⁷ Lk. 24:40.

⁸ Lk. 24:4.

⁹ Lk. 24:3, 4.

Galilee; there shall ye see him," the angels here remind them of an entirely different word of Jesus, viz. that the Son of Man must be delivered into the hands of men and be crucified and the third day rise again;¹ and finally, instead of saying nothing to any one, they tell *everything* to *all* the disciples.²

It is obvious that these two stories also, though having a common element, are mutually exclusive. The point which is perhaps of the greatest significance is that Luke drops the promise of Jesus to precede his disciples into Galilee,³ and lets the angel confirm his statement that Jesus is risen by reference to another word of the Master.⁴ Thus even the angelic message, which is the center of the story in each of the synoptists, is freely modified. In Mark and Matthew the main point in the message of the angel is that the disciples shall see Jesus in Galilee; in Luke it is to remind the women of what Jesus had *said* while still in Galilee.

We have thus far noticed the stories of Matthew and Luke in relation to that of Mark. It remains to add that the differences between these two are also not merely formal. If Luke departs from Mark in that he has two angels instead of one, he also departs from Matthew in that his two angels are *in* the tomb while that of Matthew is outside. While in Matthew the angel is apparently on the earth for the sake of opening the tomb, in Luke the two angels appear to be present, especially if not exclusively, for the sake of the perplexed women. The significant difference between the message of the angel in Luke and his message in Matthew is essentially the same as that between Luke and Mark, which has already been discussed. Luke agrees with Matthew against Mark that the women carried out the injunction of the angel (or angels), but differs from him in being more circumstantial.

So far the analysis of the oldest sources in regard to

¹ Lk. 24:7.

² Lk. 24:9.

³ Luke has no appearance of Jesus in Galilee.

⁴ It is to be noted that the angel does not give this according to Luke's version but rather according to that of Matthew (20:19).

what transpired at the tomb of Jesus on the morning of the first day of the week, the third day after the crucifixion. The conclusions to which this analysis leads are (1) that the story of the oldest Gospel was handled with great freedom by both Matthew and Luke; and (2) that the mutual exclusiveness of the three synoptic narratives shows that when these originated there was no standard tradition concerning the incident of the women at the tomb.

The question therefore naturally arises what historical value belongs to the common element in these strangely conflicting stories. Let that common element be again stated. It is that at least two women went to the tomb of Jesus on the third day after his death, that they found the stone rolled back, and that they received there an angelic announcement to the effect that Jesus was risen. The sources differ sharply as to *why* the women went to the sepulchre, Matthew saying that it was to view the tomb, Mark and Luke representing that it was to anoint the body of Jesus, but all agree that they went. All agree also that Mary Magdalene and another person by the name of Mary visited the tomb. The oldest Gospel seems to know of *only* three who went while Luke, after naming three, refers to "the other women" with them. Further, the women found the tomb open—the stone rolled away. On this the narratives are at one. The oldest Gospel does not suggest how the stone came to be removed from its place, no more does Luke, but Matthew attributes it to an angel.

Thus we face a serious problem. The women found the tomb open, but the only suggestion in our sources as to how it came to be open is that an angel did it. And from this point on the story runs into the supernatural. We have one angel or two angels, outside the tomb or within it, and their message is variously reported. According to the oldest Gospel, which is followed by Luke, the women entered the tomb, and so were presumably able to confirm the angelic word, "He is not here." But in view of the general contradictoriness of the three narratives it is perhaps too much to say that we can here

confidently accept the statement of Mark and Luke that the women entered the tomb. If, however, they did, the fact that they found not the body of Jesus is only what the open door has already suggested. But the main point is that their testimony goes no further than—to say the most—an open and *empty* tomb. That Jesus had *risen* was the word of the angel. Here again, whatever we may think about angels as witnesses to earthly and material facts, we face a serious problem. For the narratives are so contradictory that it is impossible to see behind them any definite witness to an objective angelic appearance. One is therefore led to ask whether the angel is not a literary device by which the writers sought to express the divine origin of a new and inspiring belief. This supposition would at least account for the variations in the angelic message in the different Gospels.

But however this point be judged, we must not lose sight of the simple fact that, so far as the story of the resurrection is concerned, our sources, when they come to the explanation of the empty tomb, give us the word of an angel. We are then no longer dealing with ordinary evidence, with human witnesses and natural facts—such as we find exclusively in the record of the ministry of Jesus—but we are dealing with another order of beings, belonging to another sphere.

Jesus himself does not appear in the story of the resurrection. We have a report of an open and probably of an empty tomb, but on the question what had become of the body of Jesus we have a message attributed to an angel, or to angels, who are variously said to have been in the tomb or outside it. It does not then appear that more can be accepted as historical than that the tomb of Jesus was found empty. This, however, is a point of great importance both in itself and in relation to subsequent events.

We now pass beyond the oldest Gospel and the story of the open tomb to consider other material in Matthew and Luke which has to do with the risen Lord.

Matthew records two appearances of Jesus, one to the

women near the tomb¹ and the other to the eleven disciples in Galilee.² To the women he said: "Fear not; go tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me." This event is beset with difficulties. The women have just been told by an angel that Jesus precedes the disciples into Galilee, and that they shall see him there.³ Why then should it be needful that the same message be given them by Jesus? And if *Jesus* was to tell them, what necessity was there for the appearance of an angel to give them the very same message? Moreover, if Jesus could appear to the *women*, near the tomb, why not also to his apostles? Why postpone that great event until they returned to Galilee?

There is yet other difficulty created by this passage. It conflicts with the oldest Gospel and is excluded by Luke. For Mark's statement that the women said nothing to any one⁴ certainly precludes the possibility that, in the moment after leaving the tomb, they had an unmistakable meeting with Jesus, when they took hold of his feet and heard words from his lips. It is also excluded by Luke's narrative, for according to him the women went at once to the apostles and told what they had learned at the tomb; but if they had met Jesus himself as they returned from the tomb, they must have reported *that* fact, for it wholly eclipsed the other in importance. But Luke's narrative has no trace of this superlatively significant event.

We seem forbidden therefore to regard this passage in Matthew as strictly historical. The *purpose* of the author in writing it appears to be obvious. His eye is upon the Galilean manifestation of Jesus⁵—the sole appearance to the apostles which he records—and the importance of that manifestation is heightened by letting Jesus refer to it *in advance*.

We turn now to this conspicuous Galilean appearance of the risen Jesus, which is peculiar to Matthew. The oldest Gospel anticipated something of the sort,⁶ but in

¹ Mt. 28:9-10.

² Mt. 28:16-20.

³ Mt. 28:7.

⁴ Mk. 16:8.

⁵ Mt. 28:16-20.

⁶ Mk. 16:7.

its extant form does not record it. Let us consider the details of the story with a view to determining its historical character. First, it is said that the particular mountain where the Eleven assembled had been appointed for them by Jesus.¹ But we have seen above that our oldest sources do not contain a single indisputable reference by Jesus to a bodily resurrection and return to his disciples. Hence this view of Matthew that the very spot where the risen Jesus would meet his disciples had been fixed by him has against it the lack of a single confirmatory word in the body of the Gospel. It seems remarkable, too, that if the very spot had been fixed by Jesus himself, it should have been necessary to send an angelic message to the apostles to go into Galilee,² and then to reënforce this angelic message by a word from Jesus to the same effect.³ One would naturally suppose that if Jesus had told his disciples that, when risen, he would meet them on a certain mountain in the home-land, they would have needed no command to go thither.

Second, the words attributed to the risen Jesus at this appearance in Galilee.⁴ Does the story of the life and teaching of Jesus allow us to regard these words as genuine? Let us see. Is it like Jesus to claim all authority in heaven and on earth?⁵ In the oldest collection of his words—the *Logia*—the highest claim that he makes is the claim to a unique *knowledge* of God.⁶ As for *authority*, he had authority to teach,⁷ authority to forgive sin,⁸ and authority to cast out demons⁹—that is, he had authority adequate to his need as the revealer of God; but of *all* authority, and all authority in *heaven* as well as on earth, the record of the ministry of Jesus contains no claim and no trace of a claim. On the contrary, the true and absolute dependence of Jesus upon the heavenly Father is fundamental in all that record.

Again, is it like Jesus to base the mission of his disciples

¹ Mt. 28:16.

² Mt. 28:7.

³ Mt. 28:10.

⁴ It is worth noting that the Greek word for "doubt" in vs. 17 (ἰδισταυαν) is found only here and in Mt. 14:31—a passage which is certainly to be regarded as legendary.

⁵ Mt. 28:18.

⁸ Mk. 2:10.

⁶ Mt. 11:27; Lk. 10:22.

⁹ Mk. 6:7.

⁷ Mk. 1:22.

in the world upon his own *authority*?¹ Was not his principle rather this: "Freely ye received, freely give"?² Did he not think of his Gospel as a seed which when planted in the heart inevitably develops, irrespective of all external authority? Did he not think of it as "leaven,"³ as something whose very *nature* compelled it to expand until it should touch all the world?

Third, is it like Jesus to command baptism?⁴ The record of his ministry contains no word about the baptism of his disciples. Further, that record *does* make membership in his kingdom depend exclusively upon inward spiritual conditions. In the face of this perfectly explicit historical teaching the post-resurrection command in Matthew's narrative cannot be defended as genuine.

This impossibility is intensified by the formula of baptism which is here ascribed to Jesus, which is that the nations be baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.⁵ The thought of this formula is certainly not after the manner of Jesus. For by placing the Son between the Father and the Holy Spirit the writer doubtless meant to claim that he has the same essential nature as they, that he is in the same sense and same degree divine. But neither in the *Logia*, the triple tradition or the critically established single traditions of Matthew and Luke is there one word of Jesus to justify this claim.⁶ It obviously belongs to a time later than the apostolic age,⁷ when men had not only begun to speculate on the relation of Jesus to God—for there is speculation on this subject in Paul—but when their speculations had assumed a definite trinitarian formulation.

Again, in the fourth place, is it like Jesus to refer to his communications to his disciples as *commands*?⁸ The verb which Matthew here uses (*ἐντέλλεσθαι*) is never used by Jesus in regard to his own teaching. He spoke of the commands of God in the Old Testament,⁹ but he did not

¹ Mt. 28:19.

² Mt. 10:8.

³ Mt. 13:33.

⁴ Baptism in the apostolic age was into the name of Jesus only.

⁵ Mt. 28:20.

⁶ Mt. 28:19.

⁷ Mt. 28:19.

⁸ See Part II, chaps. 3-4.

⁹ E.g., Mk. 7:8; 10:19.

add to them. He conceived of himself not as a second Moses, imposing upon men a legal form of religion, but rather as a communicator of life to man's spirit by revealing the character of God.

Finally, is it like Jesus to say, "I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the world"?¹ Certainly the record of his ministry does not offer any parallel. On the contrary, it presents a teaching which is *opposed* to this word. Thus, at the feast in Bethany, Jesus said to his disciples, "The poor ye have always with you, but me ye have not always."² In the parable of the Talents³ he alluded to a period when he should be absent from his disciples. He referred repeatedly to his death and departure from the world,⁴ but never, unless we except this passage in Matthew, to a resumption of personal fellowship with the disciples on earth. Hence we must regard the closing promise in Matthew's Gospel as a word born out of the spiritual experience of the early Church.

We come now to our conclusion regarding the character of the passage before us. Since the reference to a *rendezvous* on a mountain in Galilee is at variance with the record of the ministry of Jesus, and since the words attributed to him are throughout contrary to the clear facts and teaching of his public life, we cannot regard the passage as historical.

We turn now to Luke, who describes two appearances of Jesus and alludes to a third. All are put on the day of the resurrection, the two that are fully described occurring toward night. To begin with the incident to which only an allusion is made. When the two disciples came into Jerusalem from Emmaus, at evening of the day of the resurrection, and found the apostles gathered together, they were greeted with the words: "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon."⁵ Let two points be briefly noted here. First, we have an alleged appearance of Jesus to Simon in or near Jerusalem, though the angelic message to the women at the tomb,

¹ Mt. 28:20.

² Mk. 14:7.

³ Mt. 25:14-30.

⁴ See p. 276.

⁵ Lk. 24:34.

according to Mark, implies that the disciples—and so of course Peter—will see him *only* in Galilee, and though, according to Matthew, Jesus himself sent word to the disciples that they should depart into Galilee where they should see him. This point will demand further consideration later. Second, the Greek word here employed by Luke (*ὤφθη*), which is rendered by “appeared,” is used by him elsewhere in ten passages to designate spiritual appearances or visions.¹ This usage is uniform unless Acts 7:26 be an exception. It is used of the manifestation of God to Abraham and of the angel of the Lord to Zechariah in the temple, also of the appearance of the heavenly Christ to Paul on the way to Damascus. Therefore, from the term used, we should infer that what came into Simon’s experience on the day of the resurrection was a “heavenly vision.” The writer seems at least to regard this vision to Peter as proof that Jesus was indeed “risen,” though to us it is evidence only that he was *alive*, and implies nothing in regard to his physical body. That Peter’s vision was psychologically dependent upon the women’s report of the empty tomb may be surmised, but obviously cannot be proved.

The story of the appearance of Jesus to two disciples as they went to Emmaus has several new features. Thus, first, Jesus walked and talked with them a long time unrecognized. He interpreted to them in “all the Scriptures the things concerning *himself*,” but still they did not recognize him. Finally, when in the house at Emmaus, he blessed the bread and breaking it gave to them, their eyes were opened and they knew him.² The difficulty here is that the story presupposes an intimate acquaintance on the part of these two disciples with the last supper which Jesus observed with his *apostles*; but is it at all likely that this event, celebrated only three days before, had already been made known to other disciples outside the apostolic circle, and *so* made known that by its means they could recognize the Master, even when his interpretation of Scripture failed to make him

¹ Lk. 1:11; 9:31; Acts 2:3; 7:2, 30, 35; 9:17; 10:31; 16:19; 26:16.

² Lk. 24:31.

known? Let it be remembered that one of the intervening days was a Sabbath and the other the awful day of the crucifixion. This detail suggests that we are dealing with a free composition.

Again, in this story of the Emmaus appearance, Jesus is subject and also *not* subject to physical laws. He walked and talked, sat down and broke bread, as a true corporeal being; but at the close of the interview he "vanished" (ἀφαντος ἐγένετο). He did not depart as a creature of flesh and blood, but simply faded out, became invisible as mist vanishes in the air. Thus he is represented as a being of whose body we can form no true conception. We know physical bodies and laws, we can conceive of a body that is not subject to physical laws, but we are helpless in view of the problem presented by a body which, at will, is subject to physical laws and then, at will, is *not* subject to them. It is of course not to be declared *impossible* simply because it is inconceivable by us, for many actual things are yet inconceivable; but we may demand the strongest evidence in support of an alleged reality so astounding as a body which is subject and again not subject to physical laws.

Once more, when we try to take this story as history, we are embarrassed by the conception that Jesus, while walking with these men toward Emmaus, would have spoken of having *entered into his glory*.¹ These words, interpreted by other passages in Luke,² lead us away from earth and earthly relationships to heaven and the consummation of the kingdom of God. We should have no difficulty whatever in supposing that early Christians argued in the very words of this verse, but can we suppose that Jesus would have talked of *himself* as having entered into his glory, while he was *yet present* on earth?

Finally, it is not after the manner of Jesus to argue his case "from Moses and from all the prophets." That was what Paul did with the Jews in Rome,³ and what no doubt other Christian teachers did in those days, but it

¹ Lk. 24:26.

² See 9:26; 21:27.

³ Acts 28:23.

was not the manner of Jesus. He rested indeed upon the revelation of God in the Old Testament, and he saw there foreshadowings of himself, even of his death; but as a teacher, as the revealer of God, he certainly spoke out of his own spiritual experience. That was why he, in contrast to the scribes, impressed men as speaking with authority.¹ This picture of him on the way to Emmaus "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets and interpreting in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself" is a picture of a Christian rabbi of the first century, drawn to the life; but Jesus was not a rabbi.

Luke's other story of an appearance of the risen Jesus presents several distinctly new aspects. It was the evening of the day of the resurrection.² The eleven apostles and those with them, as also the two disciples just come from Emmaus, were together.³ As the two from Emmaus related their experience, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them. Undoubtedly the writer thought of his coming as mysterious and inexplicable. The disciples did not hear him come or see him, but all at once he was there! This coming corresponds to his departure from the two disciples in Emmaus. It is no wonder that the disciples inferred from the mode of his appearance that what they saw was a "spirit."⁴ Hence their terror—a feature wholly lacking in Matthew's story of the appearances of Jesus, and lacking also in Luke's other story.

Another new element in this passage is that Jesus offered various proofs that he was *not* a spirit. "See my hands and my feet," he said, "that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having." And a little later he said: "Have ye here anything to eat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish. And he took it and ate before them."⁵ Thus he demonstrated to them his materiality. By so doing the mystery of his appearing in the midst of them is affirmed and emphasized. Having demonstrated his materiality, as though his teaching would not other-

¹ Mk. 1:22.

² Lk. 24:29, 33, 36.

³ Lk. 24: 33, 35, 36.

⁴ Lk. 24:37.

⁵ Lk. 24:39, 41, 42.

wise be *valid*, he proceeded to say certain things to his disciples, which we shall now consider.

The difficulties of this address, regarded as history, are these: First, the clause "while I was *yet with you*."¹ But he was with them *now*, and had just given an ocular demonstration that it was he himself. These things obviously do not accord with each other. Second, the verse affirms that Jesus, during his ministry, had told his disciples that "all things which are written in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms" concerning him must needs be fulfilled; but our sources do not contain this or any similar statement. It is quite different from the thought of Mt. 5:17, and goes beyond Mk. 14:49. Third, Jesus is here represented as finding in Scripture the following points of doctrine: that the Christ should suffer, that he should rise again from the dead the third day, and that repentance should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem.² But the record of the teaching of Jesus is unfavorable to the acceptance of the second and third of these points as really from him. The oldest Gospel does indeed attribute to him a saying about "rising" after three days, but it does not define this "rising" as a rising *from the dead*; and reason has elsewhere been given for believing that the original saying was spiritual in character.³ As to the third point, it is not borne out by the teaching of Jesus. It is possible that he told his disciples to preach repentance,⁴ though even this is not specifically recorded; but there is no evidence in the Gospel that he told them to preach "in his name." Least of all is the record of the teaching of Jesus favorable to the view that he bade his disciples "begin from Jerusalem." He gave them principles, not specific directions. We say then that the record of the teaching of Jesus is distinctly unfavorable to the acceptance of the second and third points as from him.

We conclude then that verses 46-47 are more easily understood as a résumé of early Christian preaching

¹ Lk. 24:44.

² Lk. 24:46-47.

³ See p. 277.

⁴ See Mk. 6:12.

than as spoken by the risen Jesus. They are in this respect parallel to the words spoken to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus.

It remains to consider the last words attributed to Jesus on the occasion of his appearance to the eleven and others in Jerusalem:¹ "I send forth the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city until ye be clothed with power from on high." The difficulty in accepting these words as historical is not less serious than is that of the preceding verse. The Gospel story of the teaching of Jesus says nothing about a promise of the Father which was to be sent upon the disciples, and yet the speaker seems to take for granted that the allusion will be understood. There is of course no doubt that the writer had the Holy Spirit in mind as the "promise" of the Father,² but one must ask whether his conception agrees with what Jesus said of the Spirit in the course of his ministry. In the very little that he ever said on the subject according to the oldest sources the Spirit is regarded by him as it was by the great prophets.³ It is God as he comes into contact with man. It seems then unlikely that Jesus would ever speak of *sending* this Spirit.

But again it may be seriously questioned whether it was in harmony with the thought of Jesus as revealed in the Gospel to represent his disciples as unfit for their ministry until they should be "clothed with power from on high"—this being thought of as something quite distinct from the preparation he had given them. Had they not gone forth in Galilee and cast out demons? Had they not in their souls the words of Jesus and the example of his life and the consciousness of his love? Did they not know his spirit and how to gain it, and was it not that spirit which changed their lives and is it not that which is changing the world? Was it not a "clothing with power" to live and walk and work with Jesus?

¹ Lk. 24:49.

² See Acts 2:1-41.

³ See Mk. 12:36; 13:11.—The *Logia* has no reference to the Spirit unless it be in Mt. 12:28 (cf. Lk. 11:20).

The conclusion to which we are led in regard to this passage is that, like Mt. 28:16-20 and Lk. 24:25-27, it is a carrying back to Jesus of early Christian reflections on his death and resurrection and on the spiritual power of believers. But it does not follow that the account of the *appearance* of Jesus is without historical value. That might be a reliable tradition even though the address put in the mouth of Jesus were regarded as the work of the author of this Gospel. Whether the tradition of his appearance is reliable we do not yet attempt to say.

We must first consider the closing paragraph of the story and certain other data which lie outside the Gospel. According to the closing paragraph Jesus parted from his disciples "over against Bethany" on the evening of the resurrection day.¹ They "returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and were continually in the temple blessing God." It seems plain that in the thought of the author such appearances of Jesus as he had recorded were now at an end. But when we open his second volume—the Book of Acts—we hear that the appearances of the risen Jesus were not confined to *one* day but continued "by the space of *forty* days,"² and that instead of a simple vanishing from them,³ he ascended into heaven in a visible form and a cloud received him out of their sight.⁴ What is the significance of this diversity of view? It is thought by some scholars that in the interval between the composition of the Gospel and of Acts the author came into possession of fresh material and that he accordingly modified his first view. Whether this was the case or not, such varying accounts point to the absence of any fixed tradition in the church of the apostles. We should notice here a further illustration of this fact. As we have seen, Matthew's Gospel knows of only one appearance of the risen Jesus and that was on a mountain in Galilee which had been specially designated by the Master. Moreover, that appearance in Galilee was apparently regarded by the author as the final one. But Luke, on the other hand, tells of three appearances of the risen Jesus, and all were

¹ Lk. 24:50-51.

² Acts 1:3.

³ Lk. 24:51.

⁴ Acts 1:9.

in or near *Jerusalem*, Luke's third appearance was apparently regarded by him as the final one (i.e., when he wrote the Gospel), and yet the words attributed to Jesus on that occasion are wholly different from those attributed to him in Matthew. Further, all of Luke's appearances of the risen Jesus were on the day of the resurrection, while Matthew's appearance on a mountain in Galilee could not have been earlier than the third day after the resurrection. Thus these narratives are at all points mutually exclusive.

Having now before us all the data of the synoptists on the subject of the resurrection of Jesus let us take into account the words of Paul, written some years earlier than the oldest Gospel.

Paul was either not acquainted with the story of the women at the tomb or else was not interested in it, for he passes it in silence. His interest lay in the *appearance* of the risen Jesus to his disciples. Of these appearances he mentions five, and in the alleged order of their historical occurrence. He has no word of time or place, whether the appearances were on one day or during forty days, whether in Galilee or in Judea, or in both. Nor does he say a word of the *nature* of these appearances except as a suggestion is contained in the single term "appeared" (ᾤφθη).¹ This is the term he used when speaking of the appearance of Jesus to himself on the way to Damascus,² an appearance which he described as a "heavenly vision,"³ a revealing of the Son of God *in him*.⁴ Paul does not claim to have seen the risen Jesus with the eye of flesh, but only, according to Luke, to have seen a great light which blinded him.⁵ The appearance of Jesus to the Twelve and to others Paul classed with his appearance to him. But this appearance—a heavenly vision and a revelation in him—obviously does not require the resurrection of the physical body of Jesus, and Paul's chapter on the resurrection appears to imply that it did not rise.⁶

¹ I Cor. 15:5, 6, 7.

² I Cor. 15:8.

³ Acts 26:19.

⁴ Gal. 1:15.

—⁵ Acts 9:3; 22:6; 26:13.

—⁶ I Cor. 15:44, 50.

One point to be specially noted is that Paul's five appearances include two which are foreign to the Gospel narrative—viz. those to James and to above five hundred brethren—and two whose identification with appearances described in the Gospels is more or less doubtful, leaving only one, that to Cephas, which is surely found in the synoptists. That one of his five appearances which seems altogether the most important, viz. the appearance to more than five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part were alive when Paul wrote First Corinthians, is wanting in Matthew and Luke.

We conclude that the data of Paul help to confirm two points: first, that there was no fixed tradition in the early Church regarding the appearances of Jesus, and second, that the appearance of Jesus was visionary in its nature.

We ask in the next place what bearing the *Johannine* tradition has on these data of the synoptists and Paul. It describes four appearances of the risen Jesus with a good deal of detail. The first was to Mary Magdalene at the tomb in the morning of the day of the resurrection.¹ This agrees with the synoptic story of the women at the sepulchre in three points, viz., that Mary Magdalene came to the tomb, that she came early in the morning, and that she found the stone taken away; but it differs from the synoptic tradition in three important particulars. Thus it has no clear trace that anyone was with Mary Magdalene; she does not enter the tomb,² as do the women in Mark and Luke, one of whom is this same Mary Magdalene; she infers from the opened tomb that the body of Jesus has been removed;³ and she receives no angelic message that Jesus has risen, as she does according to all the synoptists. Further, it differs from Mark in that Mary reports the open tomb⁴ and later the appearance of Jesus,⁵ while there she and others said nothing to anyone; and it differs from Matthew and Luke in that Mary reports the open tomb to Simon only and one other,⁶ while in Matthew the women, of whom she is one, report

¹ Jn. 20:1-18.

² Jn. 20:1, 2, 11.

³ Jn. 20:2.

⁴ Jn. 20:2.

⁵ Jn. 20:18.

⁶ Jn. 20:2.

it to the "disciples," and in Luke they report it to the Eleven and all the rest.

Again, this Johannine tradition of Mary at the sepulchre conflicts with the oldest Gospel, for according to that the women *all* fled from the tomb in trembling and astonishment,¹ but here Mary Magdalene has an interview with Jesus at the sepulchre.² It agrees with Matthew in this respect that both know of an appearance of the risen Jesus not far from the tomb, but it differs from Matthew totally in the character of the meeting and of the communication from Jesus. For in Matthew the women—one of whom is Mary Magdalene—recognize Jesus and hold his feet,³ but in John Mary Magdalene does not recognize him at first,⁴ and when she does recognize him he forbids her touching him.⁵ In Matthew he said to the women—and one of them, be it remembered, is Mary Magdalene—"Go tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me;" but here he says nothing of Galilee, but bids her tell his brethren that he is about to ascend to his God and their God.⁶

The Johannine tradition agrees with Luke that two angels were seen in the tomb, but differs from him utterly as to what the angels said, for here they simply ask her why she weeps, but there they tell the women—of whom she is one—that Jesus is risen.⁷

Finally, this Johannine story of Mary at the sepulchre agrees with Lk. 24:16, 31, that the risen Jesus was able, at will, to conceal or reveal his identity.⁸ It is noticeable that, although the story of the appearance of the risen Jesus to Mary Magdalene implies that he was just on the point of ascending to the Father, he is present eight days later with the apostles⁹ and still later has an interview with seven disciples at the Lake of Galilee.¹⁰ Whether the author thought that Jesus did ascend to the Father on the day of the resurrection, and that the subsequent appearances were manifestations from on high, we can-

¹ Mk. 16:8.

² Jn. 20:11-18.

³ Mt. 28:9.

⁴ Jn. 20:14.

⁵ Jn. 20:17.

⁶ Jn. 20:18.

⁷ Mt. 28:6; Lk. 24:6.

⁸ Jn. 20:14, 16.

⁹ Jn. 20:26.

¹⁰ Jn. 21:1.

not tell, neither is it plain what he meant by "ascending" to the Father.

Thus taking the synoptists together and individually, in their account of the women at the tomb, there are six points of agreement between them and the Johannine tradition, of which the most important are that the stone was found rolled back and the tomb empty, and nine points of difference, of which not less than seven are virtually contradictions.

The second appearance of the risen Jesus in the Fourth Gospel was on the evening of the day of the resurrection and was to the disciples, apparently to ten of the apostles,¹ in a house in Jerusalem. It thus offers itself as a parallel to Luke's second story.² Place and time are the same, and though Luke's circle is larger than John's, it includes that. But the differences between the two stories are striking. According to Luke, when Jesus appeared among the disciples, they were "terrified and affrighted;"³ according to John, they were "glad."⁴ Again, the message of Jesus is utterly different in the two stories. In Luke it is demonstration from Scripture that the Christ should suffer and rise again from the dead the third day, and that repentance should be preached in his name to all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem. To this are added the words about the Spirit: "Behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city until ye be clothed with power from on high."⁵ Of these points, which, in Luke, are substantiated out of the Scriptures, the Johannine tradition has not one. Instead, it has the simple commission: "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you."⁶ It speaks of the Spirit, but its words are widely at variance with those of Luke. It does not promise the Spirit for some *future* time, but represents that it was imparted *then and there*.⁷ Moreover, while in Luke the Spirit is to clothe the disciples with power (δύναμις), here it is to give them *authority* to forgive or to retain sins⁸—two quite unlike conceptions.

¹ Jn. 20:19, 24.

² Lk. 24:33, 36-39.

³ Lk. 24:37.

⁴ Jn. 20:20.

⁵ Lk. 24:46-49.

⁶ Jn. 20:21.

⁷ Jn. 20:22.

⁸ Jn. 20:23.

3
The third appearance of the risen Jesus according to John was eight days after the second,¹ and apparently to the Eleven apostles, gathered where they were before.² This also, like the second appearance, agrees with Luke's view that the risen Jesus, though in a material body, was not subject to the laws of matter, for he appeared in the midst of the disciples when the doors were shut.³ It is also closely related to the story in Luke in this particular that it puts in the foreground a demonstration of the identity of Jesus by himself.⁴ The remaining words of Jesus are peculiar to this passage: "Because thou hast seen me thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."⁵ This is highly significant. It implies that from the very first days of Christianity there had been those who believed in the resurrection of Jesus though they had not *seen* him. Whether the writer supposed that such persons had heard of the empty tomb, or that they believed on other grounds, we cannot say. But by putting on the lips of Jesus himself the words, "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed," he obviously wished to counteract a tendency to lay too great stress, as he thought, on the value of these appearances of the risen Jesus.

It is plain that this third appearance of Jesus in John, which was eight days after the resurrection, excludes the view of Luke's Gospel that the final appearance of Jesus was on the very day of the resurrection, and that it also excludes the view of Matthew, which is favored by the oldest Gospel, according to which the disciples were bidden by Jesus himself to go into Galilee. Here they are quietly staying in Jerusalem and having interviews with the risen Jesus, which according to Mark and Matthew they were to have in Galilee.

4
The fourth⁶ and last appearance of the risen Jesus in the Fourth Gospel is that which is contained in the Appendix. The time of this is not indicated further than that

¹ Jn. 20:24.³ Jn. 20:26.⁵ Jn. 20:29.² Jn. 20:26.⁴ Jn. 20:27.

⁶ The writer in vs. 14 calls this the "third" appearance of Jesus to the disciples, a statement which is at variance with 20:11, 19, 26 unless he meant by "disciples" the *apostles*.

it was later than the others,¹ the place is by the "sea of Tiberias." They who shared in this meeting with the risen Jesus were seven disciples, four of whom at least were apostles.² They had spent the night fishing, and were still in the boat, but not far from the shore.³ Jesus stood on the beach,⁴ but they did not recognize him until he, by bidding them cast on the right side of the boat, had filled their net with fish.⁵ Jesus had a fire on the beach, on which there was a single small fish (ὀψάριον) and a loaf—whether for himself, or in preparation for them, does not appear.⁶

The words spoken by Jesus on this occasion were chiefly for Peter,⁷ one incidental remark only concerning "the disciple whom Jesus loved."⁸ The words to Peter are the only ones attributed to the risen Lord which seem to concern an event in his earthly life, for they appear to allude to Peter's denial of him in the night of his trial.⁹

With regard to the question of the historicity of these words to Peter the following points are to be noted: first, the conversation with Peter turns largely on a distinction between two Greek verbs (φάγειν and ἀγαπᾶν), which elsewhere in this Gospel seem to be used indiscriminately.¹⁰ Literary subtleties of this sort are surely foreign to the style of Jesus. Second, Peter is given a certain official preëminence among believers, for he is commanded to "feed" the "lambs" of Jesus, to "tend" and to "feed" his "sheep;"¹¹ but of such preëminence our oldest sources have not a trace,¹² while the division of believers into "lambs" and "sheep," which appears here as though well known, is without parallel and is vague in itself. Third, according to the writer of this passage, Jesus indicated what the "manner" of Peter's death was to be.¹³ But this feature is quite unlike the attitude of

¹ Jn. 21:1.

² Jn. 21:2.

³ Jn. 21:8.

⁴ Jn. 21:8.

⁵ This allusion lies in the fact that the question of Jesus was repeated thrice and thrice had Peter denied him.

¹⁰ See, e.g., Jn. 11:3, 5; 14:15; 16:27.

¹¹ Jn. 21:15-17.

¹³ Jn. 21:18-19.—This "manner" is apparently crucifixion, since it is with outstretched hands.

⁶ Jn. 21:6, 7, 12.

⁷ Jn. 21:9.

⁸ Jn. 21:15-19.

⁹ Jn. 21:20-23.

¹² On Mt. 16:17-19 see pp. 28-30.

Jesus toward the future of his disciples, according to the oldest sources. These do not contain a single specific personal prediction. Is it likely that Jesus' principle in this matter was changed by the circumstance of death?

So much for the words to Peter on this occasion. There was an incidental remark also to another disciple, and this must now be considered.

Peter was following Jesus along the beach, and behind him came the "disciple whom Jesus loved."¹ Having heard about his own future Peter asked what this other man should do.² Jesus replied: "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?"³ Now this answer does not seem to be in the manner of Jesus. He was always frank and plain-spoken. He knew what he willed to do and say to his disciples. If the words of the text are taken to mean that Jesus had not yet made up his mind whether that particular disciple should remain on earth until he came, then the objection to them is clearly that Jesus was not one who spoke out of an unsettled state of mind; but if they mean simply, as the writer took them, that Jesus purposely gave a vague answer to the effect that he *might* possibly wish to have the disciple in question remain on earth until he should come, then the objection to it is just its vagueness, where vagueness seems to have no practical end. Such a word was sure to be misunderstood, and what was there to justify the ambiguity?

But we will not dwell on this point, nor insist that the saying cannot possibly be historical. We say only that it does not seem to be in the manner of Jesus. If John lived to a great age, as tradition affirms, that fact may readily account for the rise of a belief that Jesus had foretold this very thing.

A few words on the Johannine tradition as a whole. Three of its appearances are at Jerusalem and one at the Lake of Galilee. Thus it combines the traditions of Matthew and Luke, for the former knows only of a Galilean appearance and the latter only of appearances in or near Jerusalem. The last of the Johannine appear-

¹ Jn. 21:20.

² Jn. 21:21.

³ Jn. 21:22.

ances is apparently regarded as the last which was known to have occurred. Thus it contradicts the tradition of Matthew which seems to put the final appearance of the risen Jesus on a *mountain* in Galilee, and contradicts also that of Luke, according to which the final appearance was near Bethany in Judea.

It remains now to sum up the results of this analysis of the four appearances of the risen Jesus which are found in John. We may say that the analysis strongly confirms the conclusion drawn from the independent study of the synoptists and Paul that there was no fixed tradition in the early Church regarding either the women at the sepulchre, or the appearances of the risen Jesus. The element which it shares with all the early narratives is that the tomb was found empty, and the further element which it shares with Matthew and Luke is that Jesus appeared to one or more of his disciples. Aside from this common element its numerous details only add to the confusion that reigns in the synoptists.

What now, in view of all the data, is to be said of the common element in the narratives? What is to be said of the evidence that the tomb *was* found empty? What also of the nature of the appearances of the risen Jesus, and of the connection of these two events?

It has been shown that no saying of Jesus regarding his future warrants an expectation that his body was to come forth from the tomb. Paul, as we have seen, whose account of the resurrection antedates the Gospel, has nothing to say of the empty tomb, and it does not appear that he regarded it as necessary to his view of the resurrection.

The oldest Gospel, however, says that the tomb was found open, and with this statement the others agree. That the tomb was *empty* also, that the body of Jesus was not there, this, in the oldest Gospel, is not said as something which the women observed, but it is told them by the angel. At this point the divergence begins and goes on increasing at every forward step. We may grant that, if the body had left the tomb, having been reanimated, it was natural enough that the tomb remained open; but

we cannot affirm that the simple fact of an *open* tomb implied that it was also *empty*, for any ordinary tomb, being intended for more than one body, was liable to be opened at any time.

That the body of Jesus was not in the tomb rests, in the oldest Gospel, on *angelic* evidence, in the later Luke it rests *also* on the *observation* of Peter, and in the last of the narratives it rests not at all on angelic evidence but on the witness of Peter and another disciple. This change in the evidence, or in the statement of the evidence, as time passed, is significant. It seems to imply an increasing sense of the importance of showing that the tomb *was* empty. It is of interest to note that the parallel fact that, while in Matthew the materiality of the risen Jesus is barely implied, in Luke's last appearance and in the Johannine tradition it is strongly emphasized. These two facts raise the question whether the interest of Christians in the *material* resurrection of Jesus, when our Gospels were written, was not due wholly to a belief that, *without* a material resurrection, the *reality* of his appearances would fall to the ground. That seems to me the probable explanation of the increasing emphasis on this point.

But to return to the evidence for an open tomb, not to say an *empty* one. The oldest Gospel witnesses to it, the others likewise. But we are bound to consider the strange divergences in the stories, for these may reflect unfavorably upon any common element which they have. It is difficult to believe that there was from the beginning a sure tradition that the tomb was *found* open on the third day after the crucifixion, and yet *no* sure tradition as to *who* found it open, or *why* any one had come thither. But such is the fact, as we have seen. John says that *one* woman came, Matthew *two*, Mark *three*, and Luke *not less than five*, possibly more. And as to the *why*. In Mark and Luke, the women come to anoint the body, in Matthew to see the tomb, while in John the same Mary who in Matthew comes to *see* the tomb and in Mark to *anoint* the body, speaks of wishing to find the body that she may *take it away*. Now it does not seem credible

that there can have been an original tradition regarding an open tomb which yet preserved nothing definite as to who came, or why they came.

As to the other point which the oldest sources, except Mark, share in common, viz. that Jesus appeared to some of his disciples soon after his death and burial, the sources, by their numerous and radical divergence from each other, drive us to the conclusion that the stories, as they stand, cannot be accepted as historical. In the freedom with which they deal with the same incident, for example, the appearance to Mary Magdalene or that to the apostles on the evening of the day of the resurrection, they plainly suggest that the writers were unhampered by the past.

Yet while, as historical students, we cannot regard these stories as historical, we must still, in the name of history, hold that *some* of the disciples had *visions* of Jesus. Paul, who may very probably have drawn his information from Peter, believed this, and the stories of the Gospels—not to mention the stupendous fact that the disciples were changed by *something* from a scattered and timid band into a bold and triumphant power—can hardly be accounted for had there been no vision of Jesus. What this vision *was* we cannot learn from the contradictory reports in the Gospels. We must either say that we do not know, or, what is more satisfactory, we must say with Paul that the appearance of the risen Jesus to the disciples was like the appearance to him on the way to Damascus. It was a "heavenly vision," a *revelation* of the Son of God *in* them.

The motives which led to the development of the materialistic stories of Matthew, Luke and John are likely to have been, first, a desire to make the appearance of Jesus more impressive and to give it greater demonstrative power, and second, a desire to gain the authority of Jesus for various beliefs of later times.

I cannot close this chapter, which will be disappointing to some of my readers, without a word on its relation to the ministry of Jesus and to the present ministry of his Gospel in the world.

And first, it seems to me that the hypothesis of a spiritual vision of the risen Jesus by his disciples is in fullest accord with the record of his ministry. That he who had most profoundly impressed a number of disciples should have appeared to them in the days following his death is certainly as reasonable as that Paul should have had a vision of him.

Further, there is no part of the message of Jesus which is in the least affected by the conclusion that the stories of an empty tomb and the appearance of a materially risen Master are not historical. That message remains in all its freshness and power. It was sealed by the life and love of Jesus. He did not teach that it was to be sealed by a material resurrection of his body.

And finally, it cannot be doubted that, for the present age and for all subsequent ages which, like this, shall be scientific in their temper and activities, the Gospel is and will be more effective when relieved of the burden of belief in the *material* resurrection of Jesus. It *must* be more effective, ultimately, we should say, the more *truthfully* it is set forth, and this belief is shown to be devoid of historical support by an impartial critical examination of the Gospel records.

The Church of the twentieth century is at one with the Apostolic Church in the belief that Jesus, having suffered death on the cross, *continued to live*; but the *grounds* of that belief which found a place in the Gospel narrative cannot be regarded as valid. The abiding foundation of that belief is not material—an empty tomb, a re-animated physical body—but it is spiritual.

INDEXES

I. Passages from the *Logia*.¹

	Mr.	Lx.	PAGE
Chapt.	3:7-11	3:7-9	126, 217
	3:12	3:17	123, 163
	4:3-11	4:3-13	133-138, 196
	5:1	6:20	171
	5:3	6:20	22
	5:3, 4, 6	6:20-21	22, 156, 158, 168
	5:18	6:17	156
	5:20	6:2, 5, 16	20
	5:32, 39, 44		139
	5:39, 40	6:27-30	156
	5:44-48	6:32-36	156, 167-168
	5:48	6:36	149
	6:9	11:1	40
	6:9-13	11:2-4	157, 158, 168
	6:9, 26, 32	11:2; 12:24, 30	167, 168
	6:20-21	12:33	166
	6:25-33	12:22-31	157, 168-169
	6:26-30		116
	6:27	12:25	42
	6:33	12:31	158
	7:1-2	6:37-38	156
	7:7-11	11:9-13	157, 169, 167
	7:9-10		116
	7:11	11:13	42, 172
	7:12	6:31	157
	7:21	6:46	140
	7:21, 24-27	6:46, 47-49	157
	7:21-22		20
	7:23	13:25-27	151
	7:24	6:47	31, 33
	7:24-28		116
	7:24-27	6:47-49	142
	7:28		21

¹ Perhaps some of these passages should be followed by marks of interrogation.

Mr.	Lk.	PAGE
Chapt. 8:5	7:1	183
8:5-13	7:1-10; 13:28-30	31, 42, 172
8:10		33
8:11-12	13:28-29	156, 158, 166
8:19-22	9:57-60	10
8:21	9:59	42
8:22	9:60	170
9:32-34	11:14	171
9:37-38	10:2	10, 171
	10:2	41
10:7	10:9	158, 159
10:8	10:9:	171, 172-173
10:15	10:12	31
10:20		31
10:24-25	6:40	154-155, 171
10:28	12:4	42
10:29-30	12:6-8	157, 169
10:32-33		30, 33, 166
10:32-33	12:8-9	31, 142, 151, 155
10:33	12:9	170
10:36		115
10:37	14:26	43
10:39	9:24	31
10:40	10:16	155-156, 183
	10:22	165
	11:2-4	116
11:1		21
11:2	3:20	123
11:2	7:18	127
11:2-3		131
11:2-6	7:18-23	10, 123-124, 143
11:5	7:22	173
11:7-11	7:24-28	124, 128, 129
11:7-9	7:24-28, 31-35	10
11:11		33
11:11	7:28	159
11:12	16:16	116, 124
11:13	16:16	162
11:16, 19	16:31-35	183
11:18	16:33	124
11:19		116
11:20-24	10:13-16	202
11:21	10:13	170, 175
11:21-24	10:13-15	10, 172, 183
11:25	10:21	41, 183
11:25-27	10:21-22	144-145, 147, 155, 167, 169, 170, 200
11:27		32-33

Mt.	Lk.	PAGE
	11:1 (?)	41
12:22-23, 27-28, 30	11:14, 19-20, 23	10, 171-172, 210
12:22-24, 43-45	11:14, 24-26	169, 173
	12:8	28
	12:5, 9, 46	30
	12:41	41
12:38-42	11:29-32	143, 169, 275
12:39-40	11:29-30	10, 23
12:41-42	10:31-32	33, 170
13:16-17		33
13:16-17	10:23-24	43, 143-144
	13:23, 26, 28	40-41
13:33		34
13:33	13:20-21	158
13:53		21
	14:25	41
17:20	17:6	116, 157, 169
18:12-14	15:4-7	169
18:15-17	17:3-4	23
18:21-22	17:4	156
19:1		21
	19:11-27	41
19:28	22:28-30	141
22:1-14	14:15-24	24, 41
23:13, 23-24	11:42, 52	220
23:37	13:34	183
23:37-39	13:34-35	55
24:37, 37-39, 40-	17:24, 26-27, 34-35; 12:	
41, 43-45	42-46	166
24:43	12:42	171
25:14-30	19:11-27	44-45
26:1 (?)		21

2. Passages from the Earliest Gospel with Synoptic parallels where such are found.

Chapt.	Mt.	Lk.	PAGE
1:5	3:5	3:3	125
1:6	3:4		124
1:7-8	3:7-10	3:7-9, 17	123
1:8	3:11	3:16	126
1:9	3:13	3:21	128
1:10	3:16	3:21	130
1:11	3:17	3:22	13, 27
1:12-13			134
1:13			249

МК.	Мт.	Лк.	Page
1:13	4:1	4:1	11
1:14	4:12	3:20	184
1:14-15	4:17	4:14-15	184
1:14, 16	4:13		185
1:14, 16, 21	4:12, 18	4:14, 31	12
1:17	4:19	4:10	185
1:19	4:21		185
1:21-28, 35-38			16
1:21-28		4:31-37	185
1:23, 29, 32, 35			186
1:24		3:34	13
1:29	8:14	4:38	185
1:29-31	8:14-15	4:38-39	15, 185
1:29, 32	2:1		187
1:30, 32			192
1:31	8:15		26
1:32-34	8:16-17	4:40-41	175, 185
1:32	8:16		17
1:34	8:16		18
1:35		4:42	13
1:38		4:43	13, 186
1:39	4:23	4:44	11, 12, 186
1:40	8:2	5:12	11, 186
1:44	8:4	5:14	13
1:45		5:15-16	186
2:1	9:1	5:1, 3	12
2:1-12	9:1-8	5:17-26	15
2:4	9:2		17
2:4		5:19	187
2:5-7	9:2-3	5:20-21	12
2:10	9:6	5:24	13
2:15	9:10	5:29	189
2:16	9:11	5:30	12, 188
2:17	9:13	5:32	174-175
2:18	9:14	5:33	124, 126, 188
2:18-19	9:15	5:34	161
2:19	9:15	5:34	175
2:20	9:15	5:35	17, 276
2:21	9:16		17
2:21-22	9:16-17	5:36-38	161
2:23	12:1	6:1	187
2:23, 3:2	12:1, 10	6:1, 6	175, 187
2:24	12:2	6:2	188
2:28	12:8	6:5	189
3:5; 10:14			19
3:6	12:14	6:11	188

Mk.	Mt.	Lk.	PAGE
3:8	4:25	6:17	187
3:13, 14	5:1	6:12, 13	12
3:14	10:2	6:13	179, 189
3:18		6:16	190
3:20-21			16
3:21, 31			19, 268
3:21, 31-35	12:46-50	8:19-21	187
3:22	12:24	11:15	188
3:31	12:46	8:19, 20	187
3:33-34	12:48-50	8:21	117-118
3:34	12:49	8:21	159-160
3:35	12:50	8:21	35
4:2	13:3	8:4	14
4:10	13:10	8:9	14, 187
4:21	5:14, 16	8:16	15
4:24	7:2	8:18	15
4:26-29			16
4:33	13:34		14
4:35	8:18	8:22	14
4:35-41; 5:21-43	8:18, 23-27, 28-34; 9:18-26	8:22-25	16, 177-179, 190
5:1	8:28	8:26	12
5:1-20		8:26-39	38-39
5:5			16
5:21, 35		8:40, 49	12
5:21	9:18		26
5:23; 7:25	9:18		17
5:28	9:21	8:44	190
5:39	9:24	8:52	176
6:1	13:54	4:16	12
6:1, 6, 7	9:35		191
6:1-6	13:53-58	4:16-30	119-121
6:3	13:55		18
6:4			146
6:5	13:58		18
6:6	9:35	13:22	11
6:7	10:1	9:1	11
6:8-9, 11	10:9-10, 14	9:3, 5	192
6:12-13		9:6	192
6:14-29	14:1-12		125
6:16			125
6:30		9:10	11
6:30-44	14:13-21	9:10-17	177-179
6:31	14:13		192
6:31-34	14:13-21; 9:10-17		14

Мк.	Мт.	Лк.	Page
6:33			192
6:34	14:14		26
6:45			259
6:45		9:10	192
6:45-52	14:22-27, 32-33		258, 262
6:48			259
6:51, 52			259
6:53	14:34		11, 12, 192, 258
6:55-56	14:35-36		193
7:11-23	15:11-20		37, 193
7:24	15:21		12, 194
7:31	15:29		12, 194
7:26-29			27
7:25-30	15:22-28		194
7:32-35			16, 19
7:32-35	15:29-30		195
7:36			13, 19
8:1-9	15:32-39		195
8:1-10			37
8:1-10	15:32-39		14
8:10	15:39		195
8:11	16:1		196
8:15	16:6	12:1	196
8:18, 23-27, 28-34			16
8:22-26			16, 19, 197, 13
8:22, 27	16:13		12
8:27	16:13	9:18	191, 197, 179, 180
8:27-28	16:13-14	9:18-19	125, 147
8:27-30	16:13-20	9:18-21	12
8:29	16:16	9:20	15
8:30	16:20	9:21	13
8:31			261
8:31	16:21	9:22	13, 31, 198, 276
8:34		9:23	159, 198, 35
8:38	16:27	9:26	159, 166, 149, 31, 33, 32
9:1			222, 277
9:2-8	17:1-9	9:28-36	259, 260
9:15-16, 21-24, 49-50			16
9:14	17:14	9:37	198
9:18	17:16	9:40	198
9:19	17:17	9:41	198
9:21-24			198
9:28-29	17:19-20		198

Mk.	Mt.	Lk.	PAGE
9:30	17:22		12
9:31	17:22	9:44	13, 200, 201
9:32		18:34	262
9:32		9:45	277, 200
9:33	17:24		12, 200
9:34	18:1	9:46	160, 201
9:35-36	18:25	9:47-48	201
9:35	20:27	22:26	29
9:37	18:5	9:48	31
9:39			175
9:38-41		9:49-50	201
9:42	18:6	17:2	175, 202
9:43			30, 202
9:50	5:13	14:34-35	15
10:1	19:1		11, 12
10:1	19:2	9:51-56	204, 205
10:2-12	19:3-4, 7-8	16:18	205
10:13-16	19:13-15	18:15-17	205
10:14	19:14	18:16	160
10:15			37
10:17-27	19:16-26	18:18-23	152, 206
10:21	19:21	18:22	159
10:21; 5:32	19:9	16:18a	15
10:28	19:27	18:28	15, 206
10:30	19:29	18:30	161-162
10:32-34	20:17-19	18:31-34	207
10:33	20:18	18:32	13
10:35-40			37, 207
10:38			228
10:40	20:23		29, 141
10:41	20:24	22:24	208
10:42-45	20:26-28	22:26	142, 208
10:45	20:28		34, 160
10:46	20:29	18:35	12, 204, 209
10:46-50	20:29-34	18:35-43	209
10:47	20:30	18:38	119
11:1	21:1	19:29	12
11:2, 3, 4	21:3		26, 213
11:11			16, 214, 212
11:11	3:17	3:22	130
11:12, 20	21:19-20		18, 212
11:19, 20, 27			212
11:21			13
11:21	21:20		15
11:30	21:25	20:4	125, 129
11:12-14	21:18-19		215
11:21	21:20		215

МК.	МТ.	Лк.	Page
11:17	21:13	19:46	216
11:18		19:47-48	216
11:19			12, 216
11:27-28, 32	21:23	* 20:1-2	217
12:1-12	21:33-46	20:9-19	217, 218
12:4			17
12:10			278
12:13	21:15		218
12:14	22:17	20:22	218
12:18-27	22:23-33	20:27-38	218
12:28-37	22:34-40	10:25-28; 20:40	219
12:32-34, 41-44			16
12:35	22:41	20:41	118
12:38-40	23:1-7	20:45-47	220
12:41-44		21:1-4	220
13:1, 2-4	24:1, 2, 4	21:5, 6, 7	221
13:5	24:4	21:8	221
13:14			221
13:5, 9, 13	24:4, 9	21:8, 16-17	221
13:11		21:15	221
13:24	24:29		221
13:24-26	24:29, 30	21:25, 27	148, 221, 166
13:26			32
13:31			147
13:32	24:36		150, 221
13:32-37	24:42; 25:13-14	21:36; 12:40	221
14:2	26:5	22:2	224
14:3-9	26:6-13	7:36-50	222
14:8	26:12		278
14:10-11	26:14-16	22:3-6	222
14:11			224
14:12		22:7	224
14:14	26:18	22:11	225
14:17	26:20	22:14	179
14:18	26:21	22:21	225
14:21	26:24	22:22	148, 276, 175
14:21, 62			278
14:22			226
14:22	26:26, 29	22:18, 19	276
14:23-25			226
14:27	26:31		227, 278
14:29	26:33	22:33	227
14:30	26:34	22:34	227
14:33	26:27		227
14:36	26:39	22:42	227
14:37, 40	26:40, 43	22:45	227

Мк.	Мт.	Лк.	Page
14:41-42			227
14:43	26:47	22:47	228
14:44	26:48		17
14:47, 51			228, 229
14:44-45	26:48-49	22:47-48	229
14:48	26:55	22:52	229
14:51-52			15
14:53	26:57		229
14:54	26:58	22:54-55	229
14:56-58			229
14:58			230
14:61	26:63	22:67, 70	149
14:61-63	26:63-64	22:67-70	230-231
14:62			32
14:63-64	26:65-66	22:71	231
14:65	26:67-68	22:63-65	231
14:66-72	26:69-75	22:56-62	231-232
14:68	26:71		17
15:1	27:1		232
15:3	27:11	23:3	149, 232
15:6-8	27:17	23:16-18	233
15:9			233
15:11	27:20		233
15:13	27:22	23:11	233
15:14	27:23	23:23	233
15:16-20	22:27-31		233
15:20	27:32		234
15:21	27:32	23:26	234
15:22	27:28	23:32	234
15:24			234
15:25			233
15:29-32	27:39-44	23:35-37	234
15:34			234
15:34-35	27:46-47		235
15:34-36			234
15:37			234
15:37	27:50	23:46	235
15:37	27:57	23:54	235
15:40			234
15:40-41	27:55-56	23:49	234
	27:48-49		235
15:42			212
15:43	27:59	23:50	235
15:44			16
15:46, 47			235
16:1-8	28:1-10	24:1-7	280-286
16:7	28:7		32
16:7	28:7	24:6	15

3. Passages from the Material peculiar¹ to Matthew.²

Chapt.	Page	Chapt.	Page
Chapt. 1:1-17	239	14:28-31	25
1:18-25	239-240	14:28-33	262
1:20	249	16:18-19	28-29
2:11-23	249	16:28	30
2:17, 16	249	17:24-27	203, 263, 25
2:12, 13,		18:8	30
16	241	18:17	29
2:13, 19	249	18:20	31
2:23	242	18:35	151
2:1, 16, 23	248	19:28	30
3:14-15	26	21:10-11	214
3:17	27	21:10-11, 14	25
5:13-14	181	23:8	162-163, 150
6:6	151	25:31-46	30-31
9:9	189	27:13-10	232
10:5	199	27:10, 24	233
10:8	34	27:51-53	25
11:28	116	28:2	25
11:28-30	181	28:9-10	286-287
13:37-43	27	28:16-20	287-290
13:41	39	28:17	35
13:44-46	193	28:18-20a	32-34
		28:20b	31

¹ Chapters 1-2 are more or less parallel to Luke 1-2.² This index does not take account of single words peculiar to the author of the First Gospel but only of verses.4. Passages from the Material peculiar¹ to Luke.²

Chapt.	Page	Chapt.	Page
1:1-4	3	2:1-20	244
1:3	46	2:9	28, 249
1:11	28	2:21-39	244
1:26	249	2:4, 39	248
1:36	128	2:13	249
1:26-56	244	2:21, 26	246
1:30-33	245	2:36-38	246
1:35-37	245	2:39, 22	246, 248
1:39, 56	245	2:40-52	48-49
1:46-55	245		

¹ Chapters 1-2 are parallel in part to Mt. 1-2.² This index, as in the case of the preceding one, does not include single words.

Chapt.	Page
3:15	125
5:1-9	37, 163-164
7:11-17	47, 264-265
8:1-3	47, 199
9:33	261
9:51-56	46-47
9:61-62	208
10:1	264
10:9	172
10:29-37	47
10:38-42	47, 150, 164
11:1	125-126
11:11-19	46
11:27-28	47, 164
12:49-50	208
12:50	207
13:10-17	47
13:33	150
13:31-33	207, 208, 209
15:	167
15:8-32	181
15:10	28
15:8-10	47
16:19-31	49
17:11-19	264
17:20-21	165

Chapt.	Page
18:1-8	47, 151
18:9-14	46
19:1-10	46, 48, 49, 209-10
19:11-28	211
19:39-40	213
19:41	47
19:41-44	214
21:37	212
22:8, 15	224
22:17-18	225
22:21	226
22:29	28
22:43-44	249, 264
22:51	46, 265
22:61	47
22:66	230
23:5-7	232
23:27-29	47
23:34, 39-43	
46	234
24:26	292
24:29, 41,	
42	293
24:31	291-292
24:34	290
24:40	283
24:44	294
24:46-47	294-295
24:49	295-296
24:50-51	296

5. Passages from the Fourth Gospel.

Chapt.	Page
1:1	62, 66
1:1-5	250
1:3, 4	62
1:4	59, 65, 70
1:5, 26	51
1:7, 15	65
1:7, 31	55
1:11, 14	63, 70
1:11-12	64
1:12	250, 59
1:13; 3:3	68

Chapt.	Page
1:14	250, 58, 62, 67
1:15, 30	65, 55
1:18	59, 68, 67
1:29, 36	65, 55, 58
1:32	51
1:33	128
1:35-42	185, 55
1:41-42	184
1:42, 45-51	66
1:43	51, 52, 55
1:49	67

Chapt.	Page	Chapt.	Page
2:1-4	267-269	8:59	68
2:11, 12, 13	184	9:1, 5	57
2:11	57, 267	9:6	58
2:12	56	9:11-41	271
2:13-22	61	9:5	70
2:18	57, 58	9:35-38	59
2:19	230, 54	10:10	53
2:25	66	10:15	53
3:3, 5	52, 59	10:18	68
3:11	67	10:24-25	59
3:12-13	67	10:29	53
3:16	53	11:1-44	271-272
3:22	56	11:3, 34	58
4:1-42, 43,		11:14	66
45	184	11:25	57
4:2	71	11:41-42	60
4:6	72	11:43	57
4:18	66	11:45	272
4:21, 23	53	11:52	59
4:26	53, 59	11:54	56
4:44	52	12:1	61-62
4:5-42	56	12:5-6	223
4:46-54	51, 56, 57, 265-266	12:8	52-53
5:1-9	269-271	12:12-13	213
5:1-47, 56	56, 57, 58	12:20-23	61
5:8	52	12:25	52
5:13	270	12:27-30	60
5:26, 21	68, 53	12:32	70
5:23	69	12:36	68
6:5	51, 57, 58	13:14-15	54
6:6, 64	66	13:16	52
6:16-21	258, 266	13:17	54
6:10	259	13:18	53
6:33	70	13:20	53
6:35	53	13:21, 38	52
6:44	68	13:26-30	226
6:46	67	13:31	68
6:53, 62	67	14:21	71
6:66-71	61, 223	14:26	61
7:1	56	15:10	69
7:19	54	15:20	52, 54
7:29	53, 67	15:26	61
8:12	70, 181	16:2	54
8:14, 26,		16:16, 22	54
28	67, 70	16:27	71

Chapt.	PAGE	Chapt.	PAGE
16:28	68	19:25	283
16:30	66	19:26-27	234
17:11	68	19:28-29, 30	234
17:21	69	19:38-42	236
17:24	58		
18:2	228	20:1-18	298-300
18:15	229	20:17	71
18:20	56	20:19-23	300
18:36	59	20:24, 26	301
18:37	52	20:31	58
19:14	62	21:1-22	301-303
19:23	234	21:17	66
		21:7	263

CORRIGENDA

Page 10, note 6, for Lk. 20 read Lk. 10.

Page 12, line 13, for 20 read 14.

Page 150, for Mt. 28:8 read 23:8.

Page 157, note 3, for Lk. 10 read Lk. 11.

Page 163, note 5, insert the reference 5:1-9 at the beginning.

Page 167, note, omit Lk. 6:22.



THE following pages contain advertisements of
books by the same author and on kindred subjects.

By GEORGE HOLLEY GILBERT, D.D.

Revelation of Jesus

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.25 net; postpaid, \$1.35

"The book is to be heartily commended for general reading, for its conclusions are the proved results of modern scholarship."—*Boston Transcript*.

"Will be most helpful to Bible students and clergymen."—*Los Angeles Express*.

"An invaluable handbook, leading to the study of essential factors in our faith."—*Northern Christian Advocate*.

The Acts

(Bible for Home and School.)

Decorated Cloth, 16mo, \$0.75 net; postpaid, \$0.84

"A notable number in this excellent series. It must prove of high value to Sunday School teachers and busy laymen and pastors."—*Geo. B. Stewart*.

Interpretation of the Bible

A Short History

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.25 net; postpaid, \$1.35

"Here is shown much study and vigorous treatment of a great but neglected field."—*Advance*.

"Scholarly, interesting and accurate."—*Congregationalist*.

"Every page of this book is of value, and it should be in the possession of every student of the Bible."—*Deaconess Advocate*.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
Publishers 64-66 Fifth Avenue New York

Other Books by Dr. Gilbert

7 A Primer of the Christian Religion

Based on the Teaching of Jesus

Cloth, 16mo, \$1 net; by mail \$1.08

The book is unique as an attempt to outline the Christian religion on the basis of the revelation in Jesus, assuming that Christianity as a doctrine is neither less or more than the teaching of Jesus. It is concerned with *facts* rather than *inferences* from them.

7 The Revelation of Jesus

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.25 net

"This is the most noteworthy historical study of the New Testament sources of Christian doctrine that has appeared in English since the publication of Professor McGiffert's 'The Apostolic Age.'"—*The Outlook*.

The First Interpreters of Jesus

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.25 net; by mail \$1.35

"Nothing could be fairer than the effort made by Professor Gilbert to draw out the thought of the first interpreters of Christ without injecting his own predilections; and the result is illuminative and helpful."—*The Independent*.

The Student's Life of Jesus

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.25 net

"Acuteness, candor, and conspicuous fidelity to its purpose are the notable characteristics of this . . . useful book."

—*Congregationalist*.

The Student's Life of Paul

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.25 net

"We unreservedly and heartily commend this volume."

—*Zion's Herald*.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
Publishers 64-66 Fifth Avenue New York

NEW RELIGIOUS WORKS

By HENRY CHURCHILL KING

President of Oberlin College

The Moral and Religious Challenge of Our Times

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.50 net

"Its appearance is timely and undoubtedly it will aid in a better understanding of the difficulties that are to be disposed of, as well as indicate the spirit of broad humanity in which they should be approached."—*Knickerbocker Press*.

"A comprehensive review of all the main features of the modern world as man finds himself, morally and religiously related to them, and a guiding clew by which man can orient himself in this respect. It is clearly and thoughtfully written and succeeds in being one of the most suggestive of recent writings concerning the soul and duty of man."—*Syracuse Post-Standard*.

"With much insight into the latest teachings of economics, psychology and comparative religion, the president of Oberlin studies the problem of human development in its entirety, as a world problem. Perhaps the master stroke of the book is the most suggestive contrast between ancient and modern civilization."—*Boston Advertiser*.

"A valuable book on a great subject."

—*Kindergarten Magazine*.

By GEORGE HODGES

Dean of the Episcopal Theological School of Harvard University

Everyman's Religion

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.50 net

Underlying the many sects of the Christian religion there are certain fundamental facts which are sometimes lost sight of in the devotion to a particular creed. The purpose of Dean Hodges's book is to present these essential elements of Christian faith and life in a manner simple, unconventional and appealing to a man's common sense. The conclusions which the author arrives at are largely orthodox, but the reasoning makes no use of the argument from authority.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers 64-66 Fifth Avenue New York

RELIGION

By HENRY C. KING

President of Oberlin College

The Laws of Friendship, Human and Divine

A summing up in brief compass and in a most winning manner of Dr. King's well-known philosophy of the end of life as the cultivation of friendship with God and man.—*Haverford Library Lectures.*

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.25 net

The Seeming Unreality of the Spiritual Life

As more than one reader comments, this frank discussion of religious perplexities marks a notable and hopeful advance in recent years in rationality, in charity, in catholicity, in spirituality, and in real religious effectiveness.

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.50 net

Personal and Ideal Elements in Education

"I am reading it with great profit. It is a magnificent utterance."—WILLIAM F. ANDERSON, Secretary, Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.50 net

Reconstruction in Theology

"Its pages represent what is nearly, if not actually, the highwater mark of skill and success in blending a fearless yet discriminating progressiveness with a loyal conservatism in theology."—*The Congregationalist.*

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.50 net

Theology and the Social Consciousness

"A valuable contribution to current discussion. . . . It is not scholastic; it is not phrased in the technical language of the schools; the thoughtful layman will readily understand it."—*The Outlook.*

Cloth, crown 8vo, \$1.25 net

By THE REV. R. J. CAMPBELL

Minister of the City Temple, London

Christianity and the Social Order

"There is a wonderful force of conviction felt pulsating in these clear and trenchant sentences."—*Standard.*

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.50 net; by mail, \$1.62

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers 64-66 Fifth Avenue New York

RELIGION

New Theology Sermons

A SELECTION OF THE SERMONS PREACHED IN THE CITY TEMPLE, LONDON

"All who know Mr. Campbell admit his goodness and transparent sincerity. He has stirred the intellectual and religious life of England as it has not been stirred for many years."—*The Standard*.

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.50 net; by mail, \$1.62

Thursday Mornings at the City Temple

A selection of the informal addresses which has done much to give Mr. Campbell a larger personal following than any other preacher in England.

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.50 net; by mail \$1.60

BOOKS BY DR. SHAILER MATHEWS

Professor of Historical and Comparative Theology in the University of Chicago
Editor of the Series of "New Testament Handbooks"

The Church and the Changing Order

" . . . a most interesting and valuable contribution to the literature of a subject that is growing in popular attention every day. While among the deeply, really religious and genuinely scientific there is no conflict or antagonism where even there is not accord, this unfortunately is not commonly the case among the masses who have only caught the forms of religious and scientific knowledge without their spirit. This book is addressed much more, it seems, to the religious than the scientific, possibly because the latter have the less need for repentance. Those who are troubled in any way at the seeming conflict between the demands of faith, on the one hand, and the experiences of their own reason and the problems of modern social and industrial life will find here much sage, illuminating, and practical counsel."—*Evening Post*.

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.50 net; by mail, \$1.60

The Social Teaching of Jesus

An Essay in Christian Sociology, of which *The Congregationalist* writes: "The author is scholarly, devout, awake to all modern thought, and yet conservative and preëminently sane."

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.50 net; by mail \$1.60

The History of New Testament Times in Palestine

The initial volume in the series of "New Testament Handbooks," edited by Dr. Mathews.

New Edition. Cloth, 12mo, \$1.00 net; by mail, \$1.10

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
Publishers 64-66 Fifth Avenue New York


















14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or
on the date to which renewed.

Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

18Dec'58MH

REC'D LD
DEC 17 1958

M106109

BT301

E45

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

